R. S.

YATHĀRTHA PRAKĀŚA

PART III

(Vol. I)

BY

His Holiness Sahabji Maharaj
Sir Anand Sarup Kt.

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE RADHASOAMI SATSANG SABHA, DAYALBAGH

PUBLISHED BY
RADHASOAMI SATSANG SABHA
DAYALBAGH (AGRA)
1957

DEDICATION

R. S.

In the Sacred and Loving Memory

OF

HIS HOLINESS SAHABJI MAHARAJ
Sir Anand Sarup Kt.

the Highest of the High, the Noblest of the Noble

the Great Inspirer of noble endeavour

in realms of spirituality,

Who departed from this world on 24th June 1937,

is this English translation of

YATHĀRTHA PRAKĀŚA

dedicated in all humility and gratefulness,

in all love and devotion !

May this humble effort carry His Message

to the four corners of the world

and bring light and cheer to mankind everywhere !!

HIS HOLINESS SAHABJI MAHARAJ SIR ANAND SARUP Kt
THE AUGUST FOUNDER OF DAYALBAGH

CONTENTS

R. S.

INTRODUCTION

The book, 'YATHĀRTHA PRAKĀŚA' was originally written by His Holiness Sahabji Maharaj, the 5th Revered Leader of the Radhasoami Faith, in Urdu and subsequently it was translated into Hindi. The book is in 3 parts and was issued in 2 volumes. Parts I and II make up the 1st Volume and Part III was issued as 2nd Volume.

In Part I, the principles of the Radhasoami Faith have been explained and in Part II objections and criticism of the followers of other religions, particularly the Arya Samaj, Sanatan Dharma and the Sikh religion, have been discussed and answered. Volume I (i.e. Parts I and II) was published in March 1934 and a second edition of the same had to be issued in August 1934.

Part III i.e. Volume II was published in 1935 for the first time and its second edition could not be issued due to protracted illness of His Holiness Sahab Ji Maharaj, the Author. In Part III, certain things in the religious books and principles of other religions which have not been explained at all or have been explained insufficiently by their writers, have been mentioned and the position of the followers of the Radhasoami Faith *vis-a-vis* these matters has been stated to show why the followers of the Radhasoami Faith are not able to subscribe to those things or to be enthusiastic about them.

The Yathārtha Prakāśa, as explained by the Revered Author in His Preface, was written in peculiar circumstances. (Translation of this Preface appeared with Part I of the English Translation published in December, 1954.) Naturally, therefore, it has certain distinctive features. Firstly, the

special circumstances in which it was written led to the reasoned discussion of the principles of the Faith from various aspects and it is thus the first book of its kind in the literature of the Radhasoami Faith. Secondly, it compares the principles of the Radhasoami Faith with the principles of other religions and the teachings of their leaders. Consequently—and this is the third special feature—the book is full of extracts and quotations from the books of other religions.

Since the foundation of the Radhasoami Faith on Basant day in 1861, the general attitude of the Satsang Community has been to keep aloof from debate and argumentation and it has been possible to adhere strictly to this principle throughout the life of the Satsang as there has been no preaching of the Faith in public nor was any attempt ever made to increase the number of the adherents of the Faith by the propagation of its teachings publicly. The Revered Leaders of the Faith always emphasized the need of the application of the teachings of the Faith to practical life by the followers and themselves led their lives according to those principles. Inspite of this, there were attempts by the followers of other religions to criticize the principles of the Radhasoami Faith and also its Leaders in their speeches and writings. After 1930, such attempts increased considerably and it became a very common feature of religious meetings, particularly in the Punjab, not only to criticize the principles of the Radhasoami Religion but also to shower abuses on the Revered Leaders of the Faith. As the book attempts to explain the correct position of the Radhasoami Faith and the position of other religions as much as can be correctly understood and interpreted from their authentic religious books, the book has been called 'Yathārtha Prakāsa' i.e. 'Truth Illuminated'.

It is expected that the book would create a feeling of self-confidence among the followers of the Radhasoami Faith and also that it would be helpful to impartial and honest

seekers after true religion. However, as the book was primarily written to discuss in detail the objections raised by the followers of other religions against the Radhasoami Faith and those raised by the Satsangis regarding those religions, the scope of the book is very wide and as such, it is a valuable addition to the Satsang literature as well as to religious literature in general.

The chief reason for the publication of the English translation of Yathārtha Prakāsa is that members of the Satsang Community who are not familiar with Hindi or Urdu, and their number is increasing every day, wanted to have an authentic translation in English to enable them to read the book and secondly, the translation has been done to meet a long-felt want of some book in English which may deal with the principles of the Radhasoami Faith in some detail. Of course, the reader will miss here the flow, elegance and force of the original, but it is hoped that this English Translation, inspite of its shortcomings, will help the English-knowing readers in correctly understanding the Radhasoami Faith.

Quotations from religious books which form part of the text of the Yathārtha Prakāsa have been given in original in Devanagari and Arabic scripts and also transcribed in Roman script, so that those, who are not able to read Devanagari and Arabic scripts, may also be able to read them if they so liked. In addition, their English translation has also been given.

Foot-notes have been added to explain the peculiar significance af certain technical words and expressions and also to explain and clarify certain statements of the text. Some original texts which did not appear in the original book have been put in the foot-notes in their proper place. These have also been given in the original as well as in the Roman scripts.

In Part I of this book, the Principles of the Radhasoami Faith were discussed in detail. As in Part II, the criticism

levelled against the Radhasoami Faith and its teachings and various objections raised had to be dealt with at length and answered, the Author selected the form of 'Questions and Answers' in this Part, for it appeals more directly to the reader and is easily understood and to make these 'Questions and Answers' quite natural, 2nd Person has been made use of. The same style has been adopted in Part III also.

Part III deals in some detail with the position of the Satsangi *vis-a-vis* the different religions, particularly the Arya Samaj, the Sikh Religion and the Sanatan Dharma. The book has therefore three main sections, one each dealing with the above three religions and two additional chapters in which appeals on behalf of Satsangis have been addressed to atheists and those who engage in inter-religious strife, etc.

As the size of Part III is much bigger than that of either Part I or Part II, the translation of Part III is being issued in two volumes so that none of the volumes may be of too big a size. Portion dealing with the Arya Samaj has been included in volume 1 and portion dealing with the Sikh Religion and Sanatan Dharma as well as the two chapters dealing with atheists etc. will be included in volume 2 of Part III.

As the Appendix of Part III contains discussions held with the representative sent by the U.P. Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, the provincial body of the Arya Samajists, and pertains to the position of Arya Samaj, the said Appendix is being issued with volume 1. Thus volume 1 deals completely with Arya Samaj and volume 2 with the other two religions and the atheists etc. This division will keep the size of the two volumes also fairly equal. This volume thus includes all that portion of Part III which pertains to Arya Samaj.

It may appear from a superficial study of this Volume that an attempt has been made to criticize the principles laid down in the *Vedas* and the *Śastras.* As a matter of fact, it is not so. As already explained in the Introductions

to Part I and Part II, the view of the Radhasoami Faith is that 'there is essential unity between different religions and their teachings'. However, interpretation of ancient religious books, with the help of grammar and dictionaries, sometimes leads people into difficulties out of which it often becomes impossible to find a way out as has been fully well illustrated by the difficult position in which Arya Samajists find themselves. The lesson that needs to be remembered is that interpretation of the teachings and writings of Sages and Seers, who had intuitive knowledge and who relied upon their intuition, by people who possess no such intuition or insight always creates unlimited and unsurmountable difficulties. Of course, no such inference has been drawn in the text of the book, but it cannot be missed by any careful reader.

It is also necessary to add here that in translating Part III, the text of the Urdu Edition published in 1935 has been followed, but in cases of quotations given, the text has generally been compared with the text in the original source and if there was some marked difference in any place, the text as in the original has been adopted in the translation.

As the book is full of quotations which have been given in Devanagari and Arabic scripts with their transliteration in Roman and translation into English, it may be more convenient for those who are not much interested in the quotations to skip over the portions in Devanagari and Arabic scripts and read through the English portions only.

It is hoped the readers will be able to derive benefit from the book.

DAYALBAGH, AGRA:

24th June, 1957

GUR SARAN DAS MEHTA

President

Radhasoami Satsang Sabha

Dayalbagh, Agra.

APOLOGY

While stating the position of the Satsangis in regard to the various principles of the Arya Samaj, many mantras of the Vedas had to be referred to. A perusal of some of these mantras and their translation would show that the ideas contained therein are such that one would blush and feel ashamed in going through them, but in order to show that the basic belief of the Arya Samaj regarding the Vedas being the revelation of God is wrong, these mantras had to be quoted (vide Chapters XVI & XIX) and their translation given in order to show that the Vedas are not the revelation of God. Apologies are therefore offered to the readers on behalf of the Author as well as the translators for the inclusion of these mantras in the book. The readers are, however, assured that nothing more was or is intended.

YATHĀRTHA PRAKĀŚA

PART III

(Vol. I)

THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE SATSANGIS

REGARDING

OTHER FAITHS, BELIEFS AND RELIGIONS

MAY THE MERCIFUL RADHASOAMI HAVE MERCY !
MAY RADHASOAMI HELP !!

DIFFICULTIES OF SATSANGIS

I

SATSANGI

After having read in detail in Part I of Yathārtha Prakāsa about the teachings of the Radhasoami Faith and having studied the practical aspect of these teachings, as described in paras 99 to 103 of the aforesaid book, readers must have formed the idea that Satsangis[1], i.e. the followers of the Radhasoami Faith, possess independent views and a serene nature, that they consider all mankind as the children of one and the same Father and as such their own brethren, that they consider the followers of every religion as the devotees of their own Beloved Lord and treat them with love and affection and also that they sincerely respect every religious leader and his teachings. And as they know from experience that without special *samskaras*[2], no man can understand true *paramartha*[3], nor can

---

1. Literally, it means a person who associates with (i.e. is a 'sangī' of) Sat (i.e. Satguru or Sat Purusha). 'Satguru' stands for the Religious Preceptor and 'Sat Purusha' for the Supreme Being. Followers of the Radhasoami Faith call themselves, and are known as, Satsangis. 2. 'Samskāras' are impressions or conformations which control all actions, good or bad, of man and which operate to bring about re-birth. Samskāras of previous lives remain piled up and produce fresh cravings and desires and these again lead to fresh actions and thus to new samskāras. 3. The word 'paramārtha' (परमार्थ) is a compound of two words, 'parama' (परम) i.e. highest and 'artha' (अर्थ) i.e. object or end of life. Spiritual development and the realization of one's Self and of the Supreme Being are considered to be the highest objects of man's life. Religion helps in the achievement of these objects i.e. this 'paramārtha' and as such, religion or religious activity has often been indentified with 'paramārtha'.

he appreciate it properly, they generally refrain from engaging in debates and discussions and, thinking that the Supreme Lord and Father of all is solicitous of the welfare of all His children, they do not interfere with the affairs of anybody. Of course, if any person wants help from them in *paramartha*, they very gladly offer their services. This is however only a partial description of the attitude of a Satsangi. The rest now follows.

2. As it has not been very long since the Radhasoami Faith was expounded, most of the Satsangis are those who joined this Faith of their own free will and determination. In other words, their position is not like that of the son of a Hindu who automatically becomes a Hindu and the son of a Sikh who automatically becomes a Sikh, so that these people also might have become, because of the established custom, the followers of the religion of their forefathers without understanding anything. Such is, however, not the case. These people went through all the stages of *jijnasa*[1] i.e. religious enquiry, have themselves gladly and of free will, without any pressure from any side and uninfluenced by praise or calumny, and of their own free choice and inclination, chosen to become the disciples of Merciful Radhasoami. And as all the books of this Religion are available in such languages as are current these days and as there has always been arrangement at the Headquarters of the Satsang that the teachings of the Radhasoami Faith be explained every day and every *jijnasu*[2] or seeker should have the opportunity to get his difficulties regarding *paramartha* solved, it is not

1. 'Jijñāsā', literally means 'the desire to know'. The word is also used in a special sense i.e. in the sense of 'enquiry into the Ultimate Truth' or 'religious enquiry'. His Holiness Sahabji Maharaj, the author of this book, has laid down principles for guidance in carrying on religious enquiry in His book 'Jijñāsā'. 2. The Hindi word 'Jijñāsu' means a person who seeks to know or who carries on 'enquiry after Truth' and also 'religious enquiry'. It is generally used for those persons who seek spiritual leaders or go to them for spiritual guidance.

at all necessary for Satsangis to depend on commentaries, annotations and notes on religious books like the members of other religious communities nor is it necessary for them to put aside their personal opinions. They are generally acquainted with the essentials of, and secrets pertaining to, religion and as they know that even a little[1] knowledge obtained through one's personal experience is far better than tons of knowledge collected from books, their greatest effort is always directed to the improvement of their internal condition by the performance of proper spiritual practices and instead of roaming about here and there, they try to spend most of their time in an atmosphere where they may have facilities for achieving purity of heart and obtaining help in making spiritual progress.

3. The result is that the Satsangi, though outwardly quite simple and docile, is internally sufficiently wide awake and alert. He always keeps his attention fixed on the spiritual ideal and whatever tends to deflect him from that ideal, appears to him as bitter and whatever tends to lead him towards it appears as sweet and charming. As he is resolute in his thoughts and firm in his intentions, he is not generally carried away by worldly attractions. Whenever he finds himself helplessly entangled, he turns to the Leader of the Satsang[2] for instructions and on getting suitable instructions, he acts upon them whole-heartedly. Acquaintances who do not understand the reality often speak of this mode of conduct of Satsangis as 'blind following' and claim that their own aimless

---

1. The Urdu word in the text is 'mishqāl'. 'Mishqāl' is a weight equal to about ¼ oz. 2. Satsang (Sat Sang) is association (Sang) with Sat i.e. Sat Purusha (Supreme Being) or the Satguru (Spiritual Teacher). Satsang also refers to the congregational divine service conducted under the presidentship of the Satguru or some Saint. The Organization where arrangements exist for such association with some Spiritual Teacher or for holding such congregational divine service is also called 'Satsang'. 'Satsang' here refers to the Radhasoami Satsang i.e. the Satsang established by the followers of the Radhasoami Faith.

wanderings and movements like those of the weather-cock are indicative of their independence and learned approach.

4. As every intelligent Satsangi makes it his duty to attend the Central Satsang[1] again and again or continuously, he naturally gets maximum opportunity for attending the Satsang and though the proceedings of the Central Satsang do not appear to those who view things superficially to be different from the pedantry and eloquence of ordinary conferences and lecture-halls in the world, yet those who look to the reality of things know that attendance in the Satsang in a proper manner secures many indescribable benefits. Every Satsangi makes an effort to remove worldly desires and thoughts from his mind before the commencement of the Satsang and after the proceedings have started, attempts to concentrate his attention internally and experience the bliss of the ambrosial shower of grace within his own self. In addition to the spiritual benefit which is conferred on the Satsangi by this ambrosial shower in the Satsang, a particular kind of light or glow is also produced in his mind, as a result of which his faculty of discrimination gradually becomes so keen that he is able to understand most difficult matters and mysteries without any effort and when he has to decide what is beneficial to him and what is harmful, he easily selects that which is beneficial. Thus when any teacher or lecturer of some other religious faith talks in his presence on a subject about which he (the teacher etc.) has no personal experience or makes a show of his knowledge by wrongly interpreting the true and noble teachings of the Seers and Saints or by giving them some wrong or vulgar meaning, the Satsangi feels simply amused and laughs. Those who view things superficially, imagine from this kind of behaviour on the part of the Satsangi that he not only does not possess any knowledge of the teachings of the

---

1. The expression 'Central Satsang' refers to the Radhasoami Satsang at the Headquarters of the Satsang presided over generally by the Satguru. This is now at Dayalbagh, Agra.

Śastras[1] but he is also incapable of understanding them.

5. As special importance is attached in the Radhasoami Faith to the *path* of the *Bani*[2] of Seers and Sages, such *path* being very helpful in internal practices, majority of Satsangis therefore naturally know how to read and write and it can emphatically be stated that, barring the Christian Community, there is no other religious community in India in which the percentage of literate people is so large as in the Satsang Community. But as Satsangis are taught to keep themselves in control so that they may achieve success in their internal practices and also because they begin to understand that arts and sciences of the world are of no use as far as *paramartha* is concerned, the result is that thousands of Satsangis, inspite of the fact that they are highly educated, refrain from making a show of their learning and those who view things superficially, speak contemptuously about them because of their own ignorance of the real state of affairs. People may however say whatever they like, but the

---

1. The word 'Śāstras' is popularly used to signify any religious treatise or sacred book of the Hindus and also any work containing commandments to be followed by men. Technically, the six Darśanas of Indian Philosophy are known as Śastras and the word 'Śāstra' is appended to the name of the particular Darśana referred to, e.g. 'Sāmkhya Darśana' is also called 'Sāmkhya Śāstra'. 2. Bānī (Skt. Vāṇī) is a word used collectively for the poetical and prose literature produced by the Saints in the manner explained in para 93 of Part I of this book. In the Religion of Saints considerable importance is attached to its recital (Pāṭh), particularly of the poetical portion, as an aid to spiritual practices. The chanting of religious or mystic poems or poems of love and devotion for the Supreme Being is called 'Pāṭh'. At the time of Pāṭh, the devotee keeps his attention fixed internally at the spirit-centre or at other higher centres and chants in a low tone, while feeling all the time that he is doing so in the presence of the Supreme Being or the Satguru. When, at the time of Pāṭh, the number of persons is sufficient, the Pāṭh is carried on by three or four persons in chorus and comparatively loudly, while others listen on with their attention fixed inwards. The chanting is generally done unaided by musical instruments. The Pāṭh is a great help in concentrating attention internally and as such, it is usually resorted to by devotees.

Satsangi remains firm in his resolve and true to his faith and thus goes on making progress and does not concern himself at all with such people except that he may now and then express his sorrow and sympathy on the misfortune of those who are accustomed to find fault with others ; so far so that even when he feels extremely annoyed by others, he does not do anything except speaking out a few words. For example, when any critic sneeringly laughs at a mention of the *Surat Śabda Yoga*[1], the Satsangi calls him 'ignorant' ; when someone criticizes the principle of *Satguru*[2]*Bhakti*[3], he calls him 'misguided'and when somebody uses derogatory words for Merciful Radhasoami, he calls him 'unlucky' and otherwise keeps quiet.

6. In short, the Satsangi has faith in the Supreme Being and in *Bhakti*, i.e. devotion to the Supreme Being, in Religion and in Religious Leaders, in spiritual teachings and in spiritual practices and also in good deeds. He respects the thoughts and feelings of the followers of every other religion. And as he knows how to make his life profitable and possesses the faculty of discrimination between good and bad,

(a) he attaches the greatest importance to the living Guru[4] than to anything else in the whole creation and to

---

1. The expression 'Surat Śabda Yōga' (सुरत शब्द योग) refers collectively to the Yōga practices taught in the Radhasoami Faith. It is so called as the 'Surat' or man's spirit is put into contact with the Śabda (i.e. the Spiritual Sound) by means of prescribed practices. 2. 'Satguru' (Sat Guru), literally means 'True Guru'. And, as a matter of fact, He alone can be a True Guru Who is in communion with the Supreme Being. 3. Bhakti (Devotion) stands for a special kind of attitude of mind towards the Supreme Being and the Spiritual Preceptor and the inculcation of this attitude of mind is taught in every religion which enjoins the Bhaktī Mārga i.e. the Path of Devotion. The attitude is marked by intense love for the Preceptor or Deity and also subordination of one's ego or self entirely to the Preceptor or the Deity. 4. The word 'Guru' literally means 'one who dispels darkness or removes ignorance and gives light and shows the way'. The word is commonly used in India for a spiritual teacher. In the Religion of Saints, the word 'Satguru' (i.e. True Guru) is generally used for the word 'Guru'.

him, the Guru is that Great Personality Who has attained the ultimate objective of true *paramartha*, i.e. Whose spirit has become one with the Supreme Being ;

(b) he is not prepared to give credence to anything unless he understands it ;

(c) he is not prepared to attach any importance to the words or teachings of any person who does not himself act according to what he says ;

(d) he is not prepared to accept and follow any such way of life as is obviously likely to divert him away from devotion to the Supreme Being and to entangle him in the enjoyments of the world ;

(e) he dislikes to interfere in matters pertaining to others and wants to utilize all his time, all his energy and his body, mind and wealth in activities which may be profitable, particularly those leading to spiritual betterment ;

(f) his heart is filled with Love for the Supreme Being and he gives preference to the desire for union with the Beloved Lord over all other desires and as he has fixed upon union with the Holy Feet of his Beloved Lord as the objective of his life and is not prepared to give up this objective under any circumstances and as spiritual progress is helpful and conducive to the attainment of this objective, he is so much attached to it ;

(g) he fully believes that the real teaching of all the religious leaders who appeared in this world since the beginning of the creation, has been one and the same but as there has been considerable admixture in their teachings on account of the passing away of those leaders, he therefore tries to distinguish between the real teachings of the Great Personalities and the adulterated teachings and considers it improper to attach equal importance to the real and the adulterated teachings ;

(h) he holds the strong belief that the true meanings of religious secrets are known only to the Living Guru or to those persons who, after receiving instructions from such a Guru, have had personal experience of those secrets; and

(i) he considers himself a child of the Supreme Being Merciful Radhasoami, a true follower of the Radhasoami Faith and a part of the great machine of the Radhasoami Satsang Organization and as such, it is his sincere desire that he may not do anything which may be opposed to orders of the Supreme Father or may be unbecoming of a follower of the Radhasoami Faith or which may lead to some defect or fault in the working of the Satsang Organization.

II

HELPLESS SATSANGI

7. After describing the thoughts and feelings of a Satsangi and the principles he holds, it appears desirable that there should be some mention of his helplessness also.

As he is a man of family, he has connections with people of all kinds and as such, when his non-Satsangi relations and dependants see him keeping aloof from the boisterous life of others, they begin to entertain doubts of different kinds about him and when they find that he is humble and submissive, they consider him to be a man without life and vitality. Somebody says that, because of his having joined the Satsang, his mind has lost all interest in the world and he wants to become a *Sadhu*[1]. Another says that his brain has gone out of order because of the *Surat Śabda* Practice[2]. His friends and acquaintances from among the followers of

---

1. The word 'Sādhu' is generally used in India for a man who leaves his family and wanders from place to place, depending for his meals, clothing etc. on others. He also wears ochre-coloured clothes.
2. The practice of the Surat Śabda Yōga. Also see Note 1 on page 6.

the Ārya Samāj[1], the Sikh Religion or the Sanātan Dharma[2] openly reproach him. The poor Satsangi listens to them all and patiently endures everything, and the following prayer rises from his heart again and again: "O Sovereign Lord! forgive them because they know not what they are saying."

For example, a non-Satsangi relation emphatically puts the question: 'What was the new attraction on account of which you gave up the religion of your ancestors and adopted the Radhasoami Faith?'

What reply could the poor Satsangi give? He clearly sees that his ancestors had no knowledge of any religion nor did they love any. They had inherited, along with wealth and property, certain religious views which they followed and ceremonies which they repeated throughout their life. But they never thought of enquiring about their purpose or utility. They remained blind followers of old traditions.

جہاں میں آئے تو آنکھ بند تھی - چلے جہاں سے تو آنکھ بند ھے -

Jahān men āye tō ānkh band thī, chale jahān se tō ānkh band hai.

Translation—

When they came to this world, their eyes were closed; when they leave this world, their eyes are again closed.

---

1. 'Ārya Samāj', literally, 'the Society of Aryans' is the name of the revivalist movement founded by Swāmī Dayānand Saraswatī. Swami Dayanand was born in Gujerat in 1824 A.D. and died at Ajmere in 1883 A.D. 2. A very large section of Hindus believes in certain set principles of Hindu religion, including caste system, superiority of Brahmans, idol-worship etc. etc. They believe that these principles have come down from very ancient times and are Sanātan (i.e. ancient). Thus all such beliefs held by them are known collectively as Sanātan Dharma. The Sanātan Dharma excludes all reformist or revivalist movements of Hindu religion (e.g. Arya Samaj etc.).

What reply can the poor Satsangi give ? If there had been any particular religion of his ancestors, he could compare his beliefs with it and then reply to them.

Another relation says: 'If salvation can be achieved only through the Radhasoami Faith, were the *Rishis*[1] and *Munis*[2] and other people of the past all mistaken ?'

The third relation says: 'My dear fellow, there is no other book of knowledge superior to the *Vedas*. Is the Radhasoami Faith mentioned in the *Vedas*[3] ? If it is not mentioned, what is the utility of this new fetish ? If this is how you act, tomorrow you would rush towards another person who may found another religion after his name.'

The fourth relation says: 'This is the time when people should engage in *paropakara*[4] and service of the country. Is it not selfishness to sit quietly in a corner of one's house and make efforts for one's own advancement ? If you love doing work, come along and join the political movement and do some real work. Can anybody attain salvation by sitting with his ears closed with fingers ?'

The fifth relation says: 'Do you not remember the great deeds of Sikh *Gurus*[5] ? What great work if any has been

---

1. The word Ṛishi is said to have been derived from the Sanskrit verb 'ṛish' (ऋष्)—'to go' i.e. one who has gone beyond this world. Or perhaps from ṛiś (dṛiś, दृश्—to see) i.e. one who sees, a seer. The word also means 'a ray of light'. 2. 'Muni' is from the Sanskrit verb मन् (man), 'to think', a thinker, but the word also indicates 'one who is inspired'. 3. The Hindus believe that there can be no knowledge which is not already included in the Vedas. 4. The original word in Hindi is परोपकार (parōpakāra) i.e. para upakāra. It means 'good of or benefit to others'. The word 'philanthropy' has a comparatively limited connotation and it does not convey the wider sense of परोपकार (parōpakāra), but it is generally used for parōpakāra for want of any more suitable word. 5. The Founder of the Sikh religion was Guru Nanak Sahab who lived from 1469 to 1538. It was a cardinal principle of the Sikh religion that there must be a living religious teacher or Guru. There were 10 Gurus of the Sikhs.

done by your *Guru* of the Radhasoami Faith ? And when it is the order of the Holy Granth[1],

'गुरू ग्रन्थ को मानियो प्रगट गुराँ की देह ।

'Gurū Granth kō māniyō pragaṭ Gurān kī deh.'

Translation —

'The Guru Granth should be accepted as the living Form of the Guru.'

what necessity is there then to have another *Guru* ?'

The sixth relation says: 'O my dear, you have not yet read the book Sar Bachan[2] of the Radhasoami Faith. When you read it, you will never even think of the Radhasoami Faith.'

The seventh relation says: 'You should not tolerate the idea of even seeing the faces of those who do not believe in Rama[3] and Krishna[4], who have no faith in the Vedas and the *Śastras*[5] and do not attach any importance to holy places[6] and fasts[7] etc. and do not believe in prescribed duties and religious activities. Are the instructions of the Bhagvad Gītā

---

1. The Holy Granth is the most authoritative book of the Sikh religion. It contains the compositions of the ten Gurus (Preceptors) of Sikh religion and also of some other Saints. It is in the Gurumukhī language. As there has been no Guru after the tenth, Shri Guru Govind Singh ji,the Sikhs believe that the Holy Granth is their Guru since then and as such the Granth is held in great veneration by the Sikhs. 2. Sār Bachan is the name of the two books by the Founder of the Radhasoami Faith. One is in poetry and the other, in prose. Sār Bachan literally means 'Essential teachings'. 3. 'Rāma' or 'Shri Ram Chandra' is believed to be an Incarnation of Brahma Purusha. 4. Kṛishṇa (or Lord Kṛishṇa) is believed to be an Incarnation of Para-Brahma Purusha. 5. Vide Note 1 on page 5. 6. Many places are considered to be particularly holy and Hindus consider it to be an act of merit to visit these places. At some of these, there are temples. 7. Hindus fast on certain specified days and dates for gaining religious merit.

pertaining to one's '*Sva Dharma*'[1] (own religion) meaningless ?'

8. After all there is a limit to one's patience. The helpless Satsangi feels compelled and decides to speak and seeks permission to answer their criticism. He gets the permission of his relations and they listen to him attentively.

Satsangi : 'Has any one of you studied religion and have you studied the *Vedas* and the *Śastras* ? Has any one of you tried to understand the meaning of the teachings of the Holy Granth ? Has any one of you performed any internal practices ? Did any one of you ever try to understand the teachings of the Bhagvad Gītā[2] ?'

A relation : 'Do you think that we are ignorant like yourself ?'

Satsangi : 'If you are not ignorant, please say from which teacher you have had your religious instruction. Under whom did you study the *Vedas* and the *Śastras* and to whom did you go to understand the meaning of the Holy Granth ? From whom did you get your training in spiritual practices and who taught you the Gītā ?'

Second relation : 'We acquired all our knowledge through listening to lectures. We did not receive any instruction from any special teacher or *Guru*.'

Satsangi : 'Is a teacher not necessary for the acquisition of worldly knowledge ? If a teacher is necessary, would

---

1. The word 'Sva' (स्व) means 'one's own'. 'Dharma' means duty but popularly the word is used for religion. Reference here is to the following Ślōka of the Bhagwad Gita :—

स्वधर्ममपि चावेक्ष्य न विकम्पितुमर्हसि ।

धर्म्याद्धियुद्धाच्छ्रेयोऽन्यत्क्षत्रियस्य न विद्यते ॥ २—३१

Svadharmamapi chāvekshya na vikampitumarhasi,

Dharmyādhiyuddhāchchhreyō anyatkshatriyasya na vidyate. 2—31

2. The Bhagvad Gītā is believed to contain the teachings of Lord Kṛishṇa. It forms part of the great Sanskrit epic Mahābhārata by Vyāsa.

it not be necessary to have a teacher for religious instruction ? And if it is necessary, why do you feel so much irritated at my having become the disciple of a Satguru ?'

A Relation : 'Is the Guru of the Radhasoami Faith the only Guru left in the whole world and is there no other Guru ?'

Satsangi : 'If there is another one, let me know his name and address. And first of all you yourself should become his disciple and then only think of discussing matters with me. As far as the *Vedas* and the *Śastras* are concerned, they are of course memorials of our respected forefathers. But we connot do real honour to these memorials by wrapping them up in cloth and keeping them in almirahs or by worshipping them occasionally or by praising them in public. It is incumbent on a dutiful son that he should acquaint himself with the teachings contained therein and act according to them. The object of our forefathers was to leave their teachings for our guidance and not to leave bound volumes for us. Now if there is some Venerable Person in the world Who has achieved internal progress and has attained proficiency in the matter of spiritual mysteries and Who explains the teachings of the true *Rishis* of the past in the language spoken and easily understood now-a-days by all and if I try, by attending on Him, to acquaint myself with the teachings of those ancient sages and also to understand important matters pertaining to *paramartha*, I do not understand why anybody should criticize this.'

A relation : 'But you do not do any work of *paropakara* to others.'

Satsangi : 'O Good Sir, a blind man cannot show the way to another blind man, nor can a man who is himself starving supply meals to another hungry person. It is easy to talk about *upakara*,[1] but it is very difficult to acquire the

---

1. Vide Note 4 on 'parōpakāra' on page 10.

ability to render *upakara* to others. If you had been acquainted with the activities of the Satsang even to a little extent, you would not have raised this objection. It is written in our book Prem Bilās[1] :—

निज उपकार किये बिन पहले, काज कहो क्या सरना है।
घर में फ़ाक़ा चार दिनों से, जग की ज़याफ़त करना है॥

Nij upkār kiye bin pahle, kāj kahō kyā sarnā hai,
Ghar men fāqā chār dinōn se, jag kī zyāfat karnā hai.

Translation—

Unless you improve yourself first, you cannot obviously succeed in anything. Your condition is like that of a man who had been starving for the last four days, but is foolish enough to invite the whole world for a feast.

'If there is a person whose family people have been starving for the last four days, but who proposes to give a feast to the whole world, by what name would you like to call him ? You have done well to make a mention of the Sikh *Gurus*. If you are able to recollect the deeds of the venerable *Gurus*, you must be remembering their sacred teachings as well. Is it not a fact that on every page of the Holy Granth the need of having a perfect Satguru has been emphasized ? Moreover, at what place in the Holy Granth is it stated that the Granth should be accepted as Guru ? The sacred *Bani*[2] of Saints[3] and *Mahatmas*[4] is recorded in the Holy Granth and

---

1. 'Prem Bilās' is the name of the book containing all the Śabdas (poems) composed by His Holiness Sāhabjī Mahāraj, the author of this book. 2. Vide Note 2 on page 5. 3. The original Hindi word 'Sant' is used for persons of high spiritual attainments, particularly those who have attained or have descended from the Region of Pure Spirituality. The English word 'Saint' does not connote this though it has been used here for want of an exact synonym. 4. Person with highly developed spirituality. It is a compound of 'Mahā' (महा) 'great' and 'Ātman' (आत्मन्) 'soul'. The word has been popularly used for persons of high spiritual attainments, whether living in family or as ascetics.

it is our duty to honour it and as I submitted earlier, the best way to respect it is to sit at the feet of some teacher who really understands it and then try to understand the correct meaning of its teachings and when we have understood it correctly, we should act accordingly. And as regards your question whether there is any mention of the Radhasoami Religion in the *Vedas*, I enquire from you whether there is any mention in the *Vedas* about the Sikh religion or about Swami Dayanand's[1] commentary on the *Vedas*. Moreover, the apprehensions you have expressed about Sar Bachan only show how simple you are. Do you think that no Satsangi gets an opportunity to read or listen to the book Sar Bachan and that this book has come into the hands of the critics only ? This book has been published in thousands during the last forty years (upto 1935) and almost every Satsangi family has a copy of this book and it is read everyday. You simply rely upon what you have heard from others. You do not know the fact that when Guru Nanak Sahab[2] appeared in this world, people used to speak ill about Him and His teachings also, and in the time of Lord Krishna people had inimical feelings for Him too. I assure you that the Radhasoami religion does not show disrespect to any religious leader nor does it decry the teachings of any religion. Of course, great emphasis is laid in this religion on internal practices, for without internal practices, man's inner eye does not open and without the inner eye opening, no one can understand real *paramartha*.'

All relations (together): 'It would be better if we wire to Lahore[3] and get some lecturer from there. He will then teach this man a lesson.'

9. In short, the helpless Satsangi has to put up with such difficulties. He has to deal with people who neither

---

1. Vide Note 1 on Ārya Samāj on page 9. 2. Vide Note 5 on Sikh Gurus on page 10. 3. Lahore was a famous centre of the activities and institutions of Ārya Samāj in pre-Partition days.

have any love for *paramartha* nor do they have any knowledge of religious teachings and who themselves remain worried and also wish to make others distressed. The Satsangi again and again prays to the Supreme Being for His Grace and Mercy and sheds tears of sympathy on the misfortune of his dear and near ones, but the difficulties of the helpless Satsangi do not end here. To give him further trouble, there are tottering newspapers, there are also lecturers in search of a living and there are pamphleteers who find it extremely difficult to be able to fill their stomachs and who are ready to vomit poison of every kind against the Radhasoami Faith and its Revered Leaders with the object of establishing their position or securing an increment in their salary or just to meet the demands of their stomach. But the heart of the Satsangi remains as unshaken as a rock. He cannot be shaken from his position by the pranks of ignorant people. He knows :—

ملامت شحنۂ بازار عشق است -
ملامت سیقل زنگار عشق است -

'Malāmat śahnaye bāzār-i-ishq ast,
Malāmat saiqle zangār-i-ishq ast.'[1]

Translation —

Calumny is the Kotwal of the market of love and everybody is not permitted to enter the street of love and it is the polish which removes rust from love. Under its influence, the love of a devotee cannot get rusted.

Besides this, he understands :—

نیش اقرب نہ از پئے کین است -
مقتضائے طبیعتش این است -

'Nesh aqarab na az paye kīn ast,
Muqtazāye tabī'atash īn ast.'

---

1. This couplet is from Maulana Rumi.

Translation —

The scorpion does not sting anybody out of malice or enmity. It is in its very nature to do so. The poor creature cannot help it because of its very nature.

The Satsangi has also read:—

कबीर निन्दक मत मरो जीवो आदि जुगाद ।
हम तो सतगुरु पाइया निन्दक के परसाद ॥ १ ॥
निन्दक नेड़े राखिये आँगन कुटी छवाय ।
बिन पानी साबुन बिना निर्मल करे सुभाय ॥ २ ॥

Kabir nindak mat marō jīvō ādi jugād,
Ham tō Satguru pāeyā nindak ke parsād. 1
Nindak neṛe rākhiye āngan kuṭī chhavāye,
Bin pānī sābun binā nirmal kare subhāye. 2

Translation —

Kabir[1] saith, "The person, who abuses or calumniates others, may never die but may live for ever and ever. I have come into contact with the Satguru as a result of the activities of such people. 1

Keep the calumniator near yourself and accommodate him in your own house for he cleanses your nature without the use of soap and water." 2

The Satsangi knows that it is entirely vain to expect a beetle to have the qualities of a black-bee. It is only a true lover, endowed with the nature of a black-bee[2], who can appreciate and value the flowers of the garden of Devotion of the Lord. He knows that this world is a battle-field and that person alone, who can bear the blows of the battle of life on his chest, can put his ideas and beliefs into practice. He has read in the Bhagvad Gita that there are two classes

1. Kabir Sahab was one of the most famous Saints of India. He lived in the 15th century. He is believed to have come from the highest spiritual region of the creation. His teachings are quite identical with those of the Radhasoami Faith. 2. The black-bee is famous for seeking flowers unmindful of and indifferent to thorns etc.

of people in this world, viz, those that have divine nature and those that have demoniac nature. People of the latter class are heartless and merciless and they are full of ostentation and pride and due to their ignorance, they entertain worthless ideas. They always boast about themselves and perform *Yajnas* etc. merely for show and in a manner opposed to the methods prescribed in the *Śastras.* They always remain away from the Feet of the Supreme Father and so sink very low into the abyss of degradation. The knowledge of these facts gives sufficient satisfaction to the mind of a Satsangi and his steps do not falter and he goes on making progress with a tranquil mind and in a steady manner.

There are numerous people in the Satsang community who for years together worshipped according to the teachings of the Sanatan Dharma[1] and also repeated Holy Names prescribed by it and read the *Śastras*[2], or as members of the Arya Samaj[3] performed *Sandhya*[4], listened to lectures and studied the *Śastras*, or as followers of the Sikh religion performed the *path*[5] of the Holy Granth[6], had *ardases*[7] repeated and wholeheartedly performed the other ceremonies too. These Satsangis are not only fully acquainted with the teachings of these religions, but are also quite competent to teach most of the critics for years together. Keeping in mind the mental attitude of these brothers, the conclusions arrived at from a study of the religious books of the critics and their leaders are placed here before the readers so that the critics may know the view-point and also the difficulties of Satsangis properly and well, and they may be enabled to adopt proper ways and means either to bring the Satsangis round to their own views or themselves to agree with their views.

---

1. Vide Note 2 on page 9. 2. Vide Note 1 on page 5. 3. Vide Note 1 on page 9. 4. Hindu method of prayers and meditation. It is known as 'Sandhyā' (सन्ध्या) as it is done at the time of conjunction (Sandhi-सन्धि) of night and day i.e. in the morning and evening. 5. Vide Note 2 on page 5. 6. Vide Note 1 on page 11. 7. The word 'ardās 'literally means 'prayer'. This is a set formula which the Sikhs repeat everyday.

III

THE SACRED VEDAS

10. The Sacred *Vedas* are the life of Hindu Religion. Before the opening of the tomb of Tutan Khamen[1], the whole civilized world accepted the Rig-Veda as the oldest book of the world and even now there is nobody who does not admit that the *Vedas* are the oldest writing of the world. But Hindus however claim that God Himself revealed the *Vedas* and that the *Vedas* are the fountain-head of divine knowledge and they contain all the religious and worldly knowledge which man may stand in need of at any time. They are, therefore, worthy of the greatest respect. We shall examine later on how far this claim of our Hindu brothers is justifiable. It should be sufficient to state here that as the majority of the brothers in the Satsang community are those who are connected with such Hindu families in which the *Vedas* have always been held in great esteem and also because the *Vedas* are the sacred souvenirs of our ancestors and further because a majority of our countrymen look upon them with great reverence, we consider it our duty to honour the *Vedas*. However, as this is the age of enlightenment and research and Satsangi brothers are by their temperament eager to understand the correct position in every matter, we have in our hearts the desire to know the real meanings of the *Vedas* and other Hindu religious books. We, therefore, according to facilities available to us, obtain translations and commentaries of these books in Hindi or English and make efforts to acquaint ourselves with their real teachings and after thorough study we find two things :—

First, that the teachings contained in these books regarding *paramartha* are to a very great extent similar to

1. Tutan-Khamen was the Egyptian Pharaoh who reigned from 1358 B.C. to 1353 B.C. His tomb was uncovered on 4th November, 1923.

the teachings of Merciful Radhasoami and secondly, that there are also many such things written in these books as have no connection whatsoever with *paramartha* and have been inserted in these books to suit the needs of particular times and circumstances and as a result of the efforts of un-intelligent friends and malicious enemies. It therefore becomes impossible for a Satsangi to have faith in each and every thing written in these books. Some followers of the *Vedic Dharma*[1] give us hopes that as research is being made in connection with the correct interpretation of the *mantras* of the *Vedas*, the day is not far off when the correct and clear meaning of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* will be placed before the world. This information gives particular pleasure to the Satsang public and they are prepared to wait for that auspicious day very cheerfully, for when this is achieved, the respect for the mementoes of their own ancestors would increase and they will have opportunity to live in concord with their brethren of other faiths and advance hand in hand towards the achievement of *paramartha*.

11. Some followers of the Arya Samaj become angry when they come across unexpected statements in the books of the Religion of Saints regarding the teachings of the *Vedas* and call the Saints as vilifiers of the *Vedas*. But it is their mistake. They should not forget that the commentaries of the *Vedas* popularly known before the advent of Swami Dayanand were those of Mahīdḥar[2] and Sāyaṇa[3], and the meanings given in these commentaries are not liked by the Arya Samajists[4] themselves. Secondly, even now research

---

1. Vedic Dharma literally means the religion of the Vedas. The members of 'Ārya Samāj' call their religion 'Vedic Dharma'. 2. 'Mahīdhar' is a well-known commentator of the Vedas. Swami Dayanand has strongly condemned his commentary. 2. Sāyaṇāchārya or briefly called 'Sāyaṇa' is the most famous of the commentators of the Vedas. He lived at the court of Vijayanagar in the 16th century. 4. Followers of Arya Samaj. For Arya Samaj, see Note 1 on page 9.

regarding the correct and real meanings is going on though it is not complete as yet. Thirdly, the language of the commentary of Swami Dayanand himself is such that very often no sense can be made out of it. It is because of all these reasons, and keeping in view the meanings of the *Vedas* prevalent at the present time and accepting the *Brahmanas* and *Puranas* as the interpretation of the teachings of the *Vedas*, that not only the Religion of Saints but the entire world is unable to accept the *Vedas* as the word of God and their teachings as of real use to true aspirants after salvation.

12. Besides, the most unpleasant thing stated in the Religion of Saints about the *Vedas* is that the *Vedas* contain knowledge limited only to the three *gunas* and as true salvation can be attained only when one goes beyond the limits of the three *gunas*, those who seek true salvation should not depend upon the methods prescribed in the *Vedas*. On the other hand, they should seek the protection of the Satguru. However, as has already been shown in the preceding pages[1] on the authority of references and quotations, such teachings are prescribed in the *Upanishads* and the Bhagvad Gita as well. As such, people should have real love for this teaching of the Religion of Saints and not hatred and opposition. We give here some more references in support of our statement and for the satisfaction of the followers of the Vedic Religion.

13. It is stated in *Prapathaka*[2] 7 of the Chhāndogya Upanishad[3], that Sage Narada[4] went to Sage Sanat-Kumara[5] and said "O Lord, teach me something." Sage Sanat-Kumara

1. See paras 202 to 205 in Part II of this book. 2. The word 'Prapāṭhaka' means a lecture. In a book it stands for a 'Chapter'. 3. The Upanishads are believed to be part of Śruti i.e. the Vedas. The Upanishads are said to be 108 in number, but about a dozen of these are considered to be important. The Chhāndōgya Upanishad is one of these. 4. A Ṛishi, believed to be a son of Brahmā and generally spoken of as messenger between gods and men in Hindu mythology. 5. A son of Brahmā who is believed to have possessed eternal youth.

replied, "Let me know what you already know so that I may tell you what is beyond that." (1) Sage Narada replied, "O Lord. I have studied the *Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sama-Veda* and the fourth, *Atharva Veda*, fifth History, *Puranas*[1], the *Veda* of *Vedas*[2], *Pitrya*[3], *Raśi*[4], *Daiva*[5], *Nidhi*[6]. *Vakovakya*[7], *Ekayana*[8], *Devavidya*[9], *Brahmavidya*[10], *Bhutavidya*[11], *Kshatra Vidya*[12], *Nakshatravidya*[13], *Sarp*[14] and *Devajan ki Vidya*[15], all these I have learnt. (2) O Lord, I know only the *mantras*, and not the *Atma*. I have heard from noble souls like yourself that he who knows the '*Atma*' lives beyond the domain of grief and sorrow. O Lord, I am in grief. Kindly take me beyond the domain of grief." Sage Sanat-Kumara said, "Whatever you have read so far is mere words. (3) *Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sama-Veda* and the fourth, *Atharva-Veda*, fifth History, *Puranas* ....all these are mere words. And you should worship the Name. (4)

"He who worships the Name as he worships *Brahma*, becomes the master of that region where the Name pervades

---

1. Literally, the word 'Purāṇa' means 'ancient' and therefore it also means old history. The Purāṇas are a part of the religious literature of the Hindus and are believed to deal with five topics, viz, creation of universe, its dissolution and renovation, genealogy of gods, reigns of Manus and history of solar and lunar dynasties of Kshatriyas. 2. Grammar has been named as the Veda of the Vedas, because it is through knowledge of grammar that the Vedas can be properly understood. 3. Knowledge about the manes. 4. Knowledge of the 12 Rāśis or Zodiacal divisons and their significance. 5. Knowledge of portents etc. having their effect on man's life. 6. Science of finding out treasures and hoards or Science of chronology. 7. Science of questions and answers. 8. Science of fixing one's attention only on one single object. 9. Divine knowledge. 10. 'Brahma Vidyā' is Vidyā or Knowledge which leads to the realization of Brahma or Para-Brahma, the Presiding Deities of the two topmost regions of Brahmāṇḍa. In a general way, it means spiritual knowledge. 11. Demonology, knowledge of evil beings. 12. Military Science. 13. Astronomy. 14. Knowledge of snakes and snake-charming. 15. Knowledge of minor gods (e.g. Gandharvas etc.), demons and serpents.

and there is no restriction on him. On this, Sage Narada asked, "O Lord, is there anything superior to Name. Sage Sanat-Kumara replied, "Yes, there is." Sage Narada said, "Let me then know that etc. etc." (5)

It is clear from the statement of Sage Narada that in spite of the fact that he had learnt so many branches of knowledge, he had no peace of mind. And the study of the Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sama-Veda and Atharva-Veda did not prove sufficient to remove grief and anxiety from his mind. Sage Sanat-Kumara, after he had said many other things, stated that 'being truthful' was better than repeating the Name. And for this, it is necessary to meditate, i.e. there should be meditation after the repetition of the Name. And only that person can meditate who has faith and one gets faith, when one engages himself in *nishtha*[1], i.e. practical performance of service to the Satguru. And he alone who knows his duty applies himself to the service of the Satguru. And he alone knows his duty who may be in search of happiness. And happiness is in 'bhūmā[2]' i.e. the Infinite. There is no happiness within limitations. The '*Atma*' is limitless. Therefore, one gets real happiness only when one comes into contact with the '*Atma*'. The *Atma* is below and also above us and the *Atma* extends to the right and also to the left. In short, the '*Atma*' is everything.

---

1. Swami Śankarāchārya has explained the word (निष्ठा) (Nishṭhā) as-

निष्ठा—गुरुशुश्रूषाऽऽदिः तत्परत्वम् ब्रह्मविज्ञानाय । ७—२०

Nlshṭhā—'Gurusuśrūshādih tatparatvam Brahma-Vijñānāya' 7—20

Translation—

Nishṭhā is readiness and application of oneself to the service of the Guru with the object of knowing Brahma. 7—20

2. Literally, the word 'bhūmā' means abundance, plenty etc. The writer of the Upanishad has however put it in a somewhat specialized sense. When one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else—that is 'bhūmā'. (7.24.1.) Evidently this and other statements go to show that 'bhūmā' refers to Ātmā.

"He alone , who, while seeing and meditating on the *Atma* in this light and having knowledge about it, entertains love for the *Atma*, feels delighted in the *Atma*, is united with the *Atma* and enjoys happiness within the *Atma*, secures supreme power over the entire creation"[1]. All his knots are unloosened and he goes beyond the domain of grief.

14. This is the teaching of the *Upanishads*, for which every Hindu has the greatest respect, but the Religion of Saints also says exactly this very thing. It advises, 'You should go beyond the three *gunas* and be one with the Infinite and Limitless Supreme Being. You should not depend upon the study of books and on external activities. First of all, take the protection of the True Satguru and serve Him. This will engender faith in your heart, then perform internal practices with faith. By performing the internal practices, your latent spirit force would be awakened and when this spirit force is awakened, you will become one with the Infinite and Limitless Supreme Being. It is on attaining this status that you would be able to get true and eternal happiness. The study and the teaching of the *Vedas* or listening to the *Vedas* is not a bad thing, but it is not sufficient to take you beyond the domain of grief and sorrow. For achieving this object, you have to be *nishthavan*[2] and in order to be *nishthavan*, it is essential that you should take the protection of the Satguru."

15. The second authority is from the Muṇḍaka Upanishad. It is stated in that *Upanishad* that a family man,

---

1. The original Sanskrit text is :—

स वा एष एवं पश्यन्नेवम् मन्वान एवं विजानन्नात्मरतिरात्मक्रीड आत्ममिथुन आत्मानन्दः ।
स स्वराड् भवति । तस्य सर्वेषु लोकेषु कामचारो भवति । ७—२५—२

Sa vā esha evam paśyannevam manvāna evam vijānannātmaratirā-tmakrīḍa Ātmamithuna Ātmānandah. Sa svarād bhavati. Tasya sarveshu lokeshu kāmachārō bhavati. 7—25—2

2. 'Nishṭhāvān' means one who has 'Nishṭhā'. The word 'Nishṭhā' has already been explained in Note 1 on page 23. 'Nishṭhāvān' would thus mean a person who is engaged in the service of Guru or Satguru.

Śaunaka by name, came to *Rishi* Angirā, who was a disciple of Bhāradvāja Satyavāha. He asked, 'O Lord, what is that by knowing which all this becomes known.........(3).' The *Rishi* replied, 'Those who know *Brahma* tell us that there are two *Vidyas* worth knowing, one is '*Para*' and the other '*Apara*'.[1] (4) From among these two, *Apara Vidya* consists of *Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sama-Veda, Artharva-Veda, Śiksha, Kalpa, Vyakarana, Nirukta, Chhand* and *Jyotisha*. And *Para Vidya* is that *Vidya* by means of which the Eternal *Brahma* is attained, (5) and so on.[2]

It should be noted that the above statement is quite clear that *Apara Vidya*, which includes *Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama*, and *Atharva Vedas* etc. cannot be helpful in securing the vision of *Brahma*. For that, '*Para Vidya*' is needed. Further on, the author of the *Upanishad* has described in detail the results that can be achieved from the two *Vidyas* and the description is worth reading word by word.

It is stated there that *yajnas*[3] and such other deeds about which the *Rishis* have read in the *mantras* of the

---

1. The original Sanskrit text is :—

शौनक ह वै महाशालोऽङ्गिरसं विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ ।
कस्मिन्नु भगवो ! विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवतीति ॥ १—१—३

Śaunaka ha vai mahāśālō Angirasam vidhivadupasannah paprachchha. Kasminnu Bhagavō ! vijñāte sarvamidam vijñātam bhavatīti. 1—1—3

तस्मै स होवाच 'द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति ह स्म यद् ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति परा चैवापरा च । १—१—४

Tasmai sa hōvācha 'Dve vidye veditavye iti ha sma yad Brahmavidō vadanti parā chaivāparā cha. 1—1—4

2. The original Sanskrit text is :—

तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्ववेदः, शिक्षा, कल्पो, व्याकरणं, निरुक्तं, छन्दो ज्योतिषमिति । अथ परा, यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते । १—१—५

Tatrāparā Ṛig-Vedō Yajur-Vedaḥ Sāma-Vedō Atharva-Vedaḥ, Śikshā, Kalpō, Vyākaraṇam Niruktam, Chhandō, Jyōtishamiti. Atha parā, yayā tadaksharamadhigamyate. 1—1—5

3. 'Yajñas' were Vedic sacrifices in which oblations were offered to gods simultaneously with the chanting of mantras or hymns of the Vedas. These oblations were thrown in fire which was ceremoniously kindled.

Vedas should be performed properly by one who desires to achieve Truth, because by the performance of these *karmas*, i.e. by performing one's duties regarding these, man goes to the Region of *Punya*[1] i.e. *Svarga*[2]. The *Agnihotra*[3] done in a wrong manner brings destruction to seven generations[4] of persons who perform *karmas* like *Agnihotra*, etc. in a manner opposed to the method prescribed in the *Śastras*, while the person who performs the *Agnihotra* according to the method prescribed in the *Śastras* and offers oblations at the proper time, is carried by the seven tongues of fire, playing on all four sides of the Agnihotra, which assume the form of the rays of the sun and take him to the region where the Lord of gods dwells. These shining *Ahutis* or oblations call the sacrificer and beacon him towards themselves and speaking sweetly to him carry him away by means of the rays of the sun and when, thus carried, he reaches the *Svarga Loka*, the *Ahutis* say, 'This is the sacred region of *Brahma* which you have attained by your good deeds.' After describing the fruits of *Agnihotra* performed according to the methods prescribed in the *Śastras*, the *Rishi* explains further, 'This status achieved by means of sacrifices is trivial. Those fools, who consider this to be the highest blessing or the highest status and praise it, ultimately fall a prey to old age and death. These fools who call themselves as *Dhira Purushas*[5] and consider themselves *Pandits*[6], though they are entangled in *Avidya*, stumble again and again and

---

1. 'Puṇya' means 'good works'. Region of Puṇya would therefore mean the Region which is attained as a result of the performance of 'good works'. 2. The word 'Svarga' is generally used for 'heaven', though it also refers to the 'Abode of Indra' etc. 3. 'Agnihōtra' means the offering of oblations in fire in accordanee with the prescribed rules. 4. The Hindi word is 'kula' which means 'family', 'race' etc. Here it means 'generation'. 'Seven generations' include three preceding and three succeeding and one of the person concerned. 5. The expression 'Dhīra Purusha' means literally a person who is calm and self-possessed. The expression has often been used for spiritually advanced persons. 6. 'Panḍit' means a learned scholar particularly of Hindu religious literature.

wander here and there just as a blind man led by another blind man does. These ignorant people, entangled in *Avidya*[1], consider themselves to be fortunate, but when they have enjoyed the fruits of their good deeds in the *Svarga Loka*, they come down again to this region of man i.e. the earth, or go down still further to lower regions, i.e. they meet with degradation. But on the other hand, those who engage in penances and work with faith find admission into the Region where dwells the Eternal Being, the Being who never perishes. The Brahman after acquainting himself with the true nature, i.e. the triviality, of those *Lokas* which are attained by means of sacrifices etc., should, become indifferent to them, for He Who is *Akrit*[2] (i.e. *Parmatma*) cannot be attained by means of *Krit*[3], i.e. by means of sacrifices and other actions. To attain Him, the devotee should go to a Guru who may be a *Śrotriya*[4] (i.e. one who possesses intuitive knowledge of the *Vedas*) and *Brahmanishtha*[5] (i.e. one whose attention is fixed in *Brahma*). The individual who thus removes from his heart the dirt of worldly desires and calmly approaches the Guru and serves Him in a proper manner, is taught by the Guru that *Brahma Vidya*[6] (Knowledge of *Brahma*), by which the Guru had Himself been able to know that Eternal True Being. (Muṇḍaka Upanishad[7], Muṇḍaka[8] I, Khaṇḍa[9] 2)[10].

---

1. 'Avidyā', literally means ignorance. Here it includes all kinds of worldly knowledge or knowledge obtained through learning. 2. 'Akṛita' (अकृत) means 'not kṛita' i.e. not made or created by any other agency i.e. by any one else. Self-existent Being. 3. From Sanskrit verb कृ (kṛi) 'to do'. Hence a deed or action. 4. The word in original Hindi is श्रोत्रिय (Śrōtriya) i.e. one well-versed in Śruti (श्रुति) i.e. the Vedas. 5. The word in original Hindi is ब्रह्मनिष्ठ (Brahmanishṭha) i.e. one who has 'nishṭhā' i.e. his own stay in Brahma. 6. The Vidyā or Science by which Brahma is realized. 7. A well-known Upanishad of the Atharva-Veda. It is called 'Muṇḍaka' because everyone who comprehends its teachings is liberated from all error. 8. Chapters of the Muṇḍaka Upanishad have also been named Muṇḍakas. 9. Khaṇḍa means 'Section of Chapter' here. 10. The original Sanskrit text is too long and is therefore not reproduced here.

16. It has now to be considered that if the result of '*karmas*'[1] like '*yajnas*'[2] etc. mentioned in the *Vedas,* is the attainment of *Svarga* for some time only and if in the opinion of the author of Munḍaka Upanishad, the attainment of *Svarga* (i.e. the achievement of the ability to enjoy the temporary joys of the *Svarga Loka*), is not attainment of the highest status and only fools waste their lives by accepting this as the highest object of their lives and if, in order to achieve the highest object of man's life, it is necessary that one must learn *Brahma Vidya* by taking the protection of some God-realized practical Guru, then obviously the Satsangi does not commit any fault if he remains indifferent to the joys and the pleasures of *Svarga* and directs his attention towards the *Sat Purusha*[3] and after searching like a true seeker, takes the protection of a Guru Who, he believes, has attained the highest status, i.e. has become one with the Supreme Being. As a matter of fact, after reading these two statements of the *Upanishads,* there is no force left in the argument of the critics except mere prejudice. And in reality, there is no difference between this teaching of the *Upanishads* and the teachings of the Satsang. For further corroboration just see what the Bhagvad Gita also has to say.

17. Lord Krishna has stated in the 9th Chapter of Bhagvad Gita—'People who know the three *Vedas,* who drink the *Soma*[4] juice and who are free from sins, worship me by performing sacrifices and pray to me to be taken to the *Svarga Loka* and after attaining access into the *Loka* of the Lord of gods, i.e. Indra, partake of the enjoyments of the gods in *Svarga.* And after enjoying the pleasures of this magnificent *Svarga Loka,* they return to this earth, the land of mortals after the merit they had earned

---

1. Works or deeds believed to lead to spiritual merit are also often termed 'karmas' 2. 'Yajñas' i.e. sacrifices etc. 3. True Being i.e. the Supreme Being. 4. Among Aryans of the Vedic period the juice of 'Sōma' plant was a common beverage. The word in original is 'Sōmpā' which means one who takes Sōma after the sacrifice. Thus, a sacrificer.

on account of their good actions is exhausted. In other words, those who desire the fulfilment of their wishes after they have performed the duties prescribed in the three *Vedas*, end up in attaining only the cycle of births and deaths[1]. (*Ślokas* 20, 21).

From these statements also, it is clear that the '*karmas*' e.g. '*yajnas*' etc. mentioned in the *Vedas* have been accepted as helpful in the attainment of the *Svarga Loka* only, and as has already been stated, this *Svarga Loka* is within the limits of the three *gunas*[2].

18. *Question.* It appears from your statements that Satsangis have respect for the *Vedas*, but they do not accept them as books revealed by God or as the word of God.

Answer. The Satsangis, modest as they are, are helpless on account of their nature and temperament. They are incapable of accepting anything without fully understanding it. They develop faith even in their Venerable Guru after considerable thought. They hate to believe in things simply on the basis of mere hearsay. They see clearly that the *Vedas* are said to have thousands of *Śakhas*.[3] Besides, there are many commentaries on the *Vedas* still in vogue. One person praises one *Śakha* and the other has faith in another commentary.

---

1. The Ślokas in the original Sanskrit are :—

त्रैविद्या मां सोमपाः पूतपापायज्ञैरिष्ट्वास्वर्गतिं प्रार्थयन्ते ।
ते पुण्यमासाद्य सुरेन्द्रलोकमश्नन्ति दिव्यान्दिवि देवभोगान् ॥ ९—२०
ते तं भुक्त्वा स्वर्गलोकं विशालं क्षीणे पुण्ये मर्त्यलोकं विशन्ति ।
एवं त्रयीधर्ममनुप्रपन्ना गतागतं कामकामा लभन्ते ॥ ९—२१

Traividyā mām Sōmapāh pūtapāpāyajñairishṭvāsvargatim prārthayante,
Te puṇyamāsādya Surendralōkamaśnanti divyāndivi devabhōgān. 9—20
Te tam bhuktvā svargalōkam viśālam kshīṇe puṇye martyalōkam viśanti,
Evam trayīdharmamanuprapannā gatāgatam kāmakāmā labhante.9—21

2. The three guṇas are—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. Creation within the sphere of 3 guṇas is perishable. 3. The word 'Śākhā' literally means a branch or division. In the case of the Vedas, it means a school of a particular Veda having its own traditional text and interpretation e.g. Ṛig-Veda had Śākhās of Śākalas, Bāshkalas, Āśvalāyanas. Śānkhāyanas and Māṇḍukāyanas etc.. Similarly, other Vedas also have Śākhās.

In ordinary parlance the *Vedas* are said to be one, but when it comes to believing in them, they are said to have many *Śakhas* and many commentaries. Which one of these should the Satsangi accept as divine and as having been revealed by God ? There cannot be different meanings of the Word of God. Moreover, according to Sage Manu, any person, who incorrectly interprets the meaning of the *Vedas*, goes to Hell[1]. When there is evident difference in the texts of the different *Śakhas* and in the meanings given in various commentaries, it necessarily follows that persons responsible for these *Śakhas* and commentaries have committed mistakes. These poor people accepted the *Vedas* to be the word of God and they tried to popularize them and to understand as well as to explain their meanings. And what did they gain ? The only result was that, on account of the different texts of the *Vedas* and because the real meaning could not be understood, all these people became liable to be sent to Hell. Under these circumstances, if Satsangis behave cautiously and take care not to commit such mistakes, obviously their conduct should be considered worthy of praise. Satsangis have neither hatred nor enmity for the *Vedas*. If any person can interpret the *Vedas* correctly and can also establish that particular *mantras*[2] were revealed by God and are therefore authoritative, the Satsangis are quite willing to study the meanings of those *mantras* and if they are able to understand those meanings and find them acceptable according to their standards, they will not hesitate even for a moment in accepting those particular teachings as revealed by God.

19. *Question*. It appears that you have not studied the books written by Swami Dayanand. If you had studied them, these doubts would never have arisen in your mind.

---

1. The Ślōka of Manusmriti referred to is :—

ब्रह्म यस्त्वननुज्ञातमधीयानादवाप्नुयात् । स ब्रह्मस्तेयसंयुक्तो नरकं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ (२—११६)

Brahma yastvananujñātamadhīyānādavāpnuyāt,
Sa Brahmasteyasamyuktō narakam pratipadyate. (II—116)

2. Sacred verses of the Vedas which form part af Sūktas or hymns.

Answer. You are mistaken. Every effort has been made to study the books of Swami Dayanand and the arguments advanced by him have been fully considered, but when the opinions of Research Scholars and Learned Pandits of the Arya Samaj itself do not tally with the opinions of Swami Dayanand, what can the helpless Satsangi do? Pamphlets which have been published recently regarding the opinions and ideas of Pt. Viśvabandhu, M. A., M. O. L., Principal Brāhma Mahāvidyālaya and President, Arya Samaj, Anarkali, Lahore, and Pt. Bhagavad Datta, B.A., Research Scholar, D. A. V. College, Lahore, may be perused. It would be seen how great a difference there is between the researches of these two gentlemen and the statements of Swami Dayanand. It has been alleged against Pt. Viśvabandhu that he believes that —

(1) the *Rishis* wrote the *Vedas* at different times, whereas Swami Dayanand has stated that the *Vedas* were revealed by God in the beginning of the creation;

(2) those *Rishis* whose names are given at the top of the various *Suktas*[1] were the authors of those *Suktas*, whereas the statement of Swami Dayanand is that *Vedas* were revealed to the four *Rishis*, viz. 'Agni', 'Vāyu', 'Āditya' and 'Angirā';

(3) the language of the *Vedas* is man's creation, whereas according to the opinion of Swami Dayanand, the language of the *Vedas* is the language of God;

(4) the *Vedas* contain the history of kings and *Rishis*, whereas according to the belief of Swami Dayanand, there is no such history in the *Vedas*;

(5) there is salutation to snakes in some *mantras* of the *Vedas*, whereas Swami Dayanand says that the salutations have been made only to God;

(6) there is no definite doctrine or principle mentioned

---

1. Vedic hymns.

in the *Vedas* whereas Swami Dayanand believes that there are definite doctrines and principles.

20. Besides this the opinion which Pt. Visvabandhu has expressed on page 93 of his book 'Āryodaya' regarding the commentary of Swami Dayanand is worth reading. It is stated there :—

भाष्य शैली का निश्चय एक व्यक्ति नहीं कर सकता; इसके लिए सामुदायिक पुरुषार्थ की आवश्यकता है। स्वामी जी के भाष्य में बीसों स्थानों पर कई कई शब्द छूटे हुए हैं । वैदिक अर्थों के समन्वय का तो अभी कोई प्रयत्न हुआ ही नहीं। जो कुछ अर्थ किये गए हैं वह भी आपाधापी से पूर्ण हैं (देखिए 'पंडित विश्वबन्धु और आर्यसमाज' पं० खुशालचन्द द्वारा प्रकाशित)

Bhāshya-śailī kā niśchaya ek vyakti nahīn kar saktā; iske liye sāmudāyik purushārtha kī āvaśyakatā hai. Swami ji ke Bhāshya men bīsōn sthānōn par kayee kayee śabda uṛe hue hain. Vaidik arthōn ke samanvaya kā tō abhī kōyee prayatna huā hī nahīn. Jō kuchh arth kiye gaye hain voh bhī āpādhāpī se pūrṇa hain. (Vide 'Pandit Viśvabandhu aur Ārya Samāj', published by Pandit Khushalchand).

Translation —

One single individual cannot decide about the style to be adopted for the commentary of the *Vedas*; a collective effort is needed for this. There are many words missing at scores of places in the commentary of Swami Dayanand. So far, no effort has been made to correlate the meanings of the *Vedas*. Whatever interpretations have been given so far are all the result of individual whims.

21. Similarly twenty-two allegations have been levelled against Pt. Bhagavad Datta. Some of them are mentioned below :—

(1) Pandit ji[1] does not believe the *Śakhas*[2] to be

---

1. i.e. Pandit Bhagavad Datta. 2. Vide Note 3 on page 29.

man's creation whereas Swami Dayanand believes the *Śakha* literature to be work of man;

(2) Pandit ji does not consider the words of the *Vedas* as eternal;

(3) Pandit ji believes that spells and charms are mentioned in the *Vedas* ;

(4) Pandit ji believes that Heaven and Hell are particular *Lokas*;

(5) Pandit ji thinks that the *'Sanyasaśrama'*[1] is opposed to the teachings of the *Vedas* ;

(6) Pandit ji is of the opinion that it is not permissible for the *Śudras*[2] to read the *Vedas*;

(7) Pandit ji considers the sale and purchase of man for the *Vedic Yajnas* as quite in order;

(8) Pandit ji admits animal sacrifices as justifiable according to the *Vedas* ;

(9) Pandit ji admits that the ignoble custom of human sacrifice formed a part of the *Vedic Karmakanda*[3];

(10) Pandit ji believes that the *Rishis* to whom the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed lived in the time of *Mahabharata* ;

(11) Pandit ji is of the opinion that there are some

---

1. Hindus divided man's life into four periods. The first period, Brahmacharya Āśrama of 25 years was for leading a life of celibacy and for studies, the second, Gṛihastha Āśrama, for leading a family man's life, the third, Vānaprastha, for secluded life of meditation etc. and the fourth, 'Sanyāsa' refers to the fourth period of life when the Brahman abandons everything and goes about preaching virtue to men. 2. The lowest of the four original castes of Hindus. Śūdras served the higher castes. 3. 'Kānda' means division or section. The Vedas are believed to have two divisions according to the subject matter of the Vedas, viz, one dealing with 'karmas' i.e. sacrifices, ceremonies etc. and known as Karma-kāṇḍa and the second, dealing with divine knowledge and known as Jñāna-kāṇḍa.

portions of the *Vedas* about which it can definitely be said that they are the creation of man;

(12) The *Vedas* contain stories and tales;

(13) Many of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are missing and the *Vedas* as they are at present are incomplete. Besides, there is considerable portion of the *Vedas* which was added later on. (Vide *Pt. Bhagavad Datta ke Bayees Siddhanta*' published by Rishi-bhakt Pandit S. D. Sharma, Shastri, Research Scholar, Lahore).

22. It is not for us to decide how far these allegations are justified. We know of course that on account of this difference of opinion in religious matters, an attempt has been made to remove Pt. Viśvabandhu from the staff of the Brāhma Mahāvidyalaya, which is a Department of the D.A.V. College[1], Lahore and also that even within the Arya Samaj itself there are numerous such individuals whose opinions regarding the *Vedas* and the beliefs of Swami Dayanand are to a great extent similar to those of the Satsangis.

Pt. Bhagavad Datta in Part 2 of his book 'History of Vedic Literature' has recorded the following results of his researches :—

(१) ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों में जो यज्ञ कहे गये हैं उनमें से अनेकों में बलिदान का विधान पाया जाता है। हमारा निज का इस बलिदान वाले यज्ञ में विश्वास नहीं। (पृष्ठ २०४)

(1) Brāhmaṇa Granthōn men jō yajña kahe gaye hain unmen se anekōn men balidān kā vidhān pāyā jātā hai. Hamārā nij kā is balidān vāle yajña men viśvās nahīn. (Page 204)

Translation —

(1) Many of the *yajnas* mentioned in the *Brahmanas*

---

1. D.A.V. College i.e. the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore was the leading educational institution of the Arya Samajists before Partition of India in 1947.

contain provision for animal sacrifices. For our part, we do not believe in the *yajnas* containing this provision for animal sacrifices. (Page 204)

(२) ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों में सब शुभ कर्मों का फल स्वर्ग कहा गया है —

ये हि जनाः पुण्यकृतः स्वर्गं लोकं यन्ति। शत० ६—५—४—८

अर्थात् जो मनुष्य पुण्य कर्म करने वाले हैं, वे स्वर्ग लोक को जाते हैं। यही स्वर्ग लोक यज्ञ, तप आदि से भी प्राप्त होता है। (पृष्ठ २१३)

"(2) Brāhmaṇa Granthōn men sab śubh karmōn kā phal svarga kahā gayā hai—

'Ye hi janāh puṇyakṛitah svargam lōkam yanti'
(Śatapatha Brahmaṇa[1] 6, 5, 4, 8).

Arthāt jō manushya puṇya karne vāle hain, ve Svargalōka kō jāte hain. Yehi Svargalōka yajña, tap ādi se bhī prāpta hōtā hai." (Page 213)

Translation —

(2) The result of all good actions has been stated in the *Brahmanas* as '*Svarga*'.[2]

"Those people who perform good actions go to *Svarga Loka*." (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 6. 5. 4. 8)

This same *Svarga Loka* can be attained by means of *yajnas*, penances, etc. (Page 213).

(3) It is stated at one place in the Aitereya Brāhmaṇa[3] :—

'एक तेज घोड़ा हज़ार दिन में जितना चलता है, उतना ही यहाँ से स्वर्गलोक है।' (पृष्ठ २१३)

---

1. Brāhmaṇas are books which contain rules regarding sacrifices and detailed explanations and also legends, some of which have historical value. They are considered to be parts of the Śruti i.e. the Vedas. 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa' is a well-known Brāhmaṇa of Śukla Yajur-Veda. Literally, the expression means 'a Brāhmaṇa with a hundred paths'. 2. Vide Note 2 on page 26. 3. A Brāhmaṇa of Ṛig-Veda by Sage Aitereya. It deals with the duties of Hōtṛi priests who performed sacrifices.

"Ek tez ghōṛā hazār din men jitnā chaltā hai, utnā hī yahān se Svarga Lōka hai." (Page 213)

"The distance that a fast pony travels in a thousand days, is the distance of *Svarga*[1] *Loka* from this earth." (Page 213)

(४) "ब्राह्मणों में कई स्थानों पर सूर्यलोक भी स्वर्गलोक कहा गया है—
एष (आदित्यः) स्वर्गो लोकः। (तै० ब्रा० ३—८—१०—३)

अर्थात् यह सूर्य ही स्वर्ग लोक है।.........और भी अनेक पदार्थ हैं, जो स्वर्गलोक के नाम से पुकारे गये हैं। सब का भाव यही प्रतीत होता है कि सुख विशेष का ही नाम स्वर्गलोक है, चाहे वह इस पृथ्वी पर भोगा जावे, या ईश्वर की इस अथाह सृष्टि में से किसी और लोक में। होगा वह लोक भी ऐसा ही। हाँ, इतना संभव है कि वहाँ दुःख कुछ कम हों। (पृष्ठ २१४)

(4) "Brāhmaṇōn men kayee sthānōn par Sūryalōka bhī Svarga Lōka kahā gayā hai—
Esha (Ādityaḥ) Svargō Lōkaḥ. (Taitt. Brāh. 3—8—10—3)

Arthāt yeh Sūrya hī Svargalōka hai. ....Aur bhī anek padārtha hain, jō Svarga Lōka ke nām se pukāre gaye hain. Sab kā bhāv yehī pratīt hōtā hai ki sukhviśesha kā hī nām Svarga Lōka hai, chāhe voh is pṛithvī par bhōgā jāve, yā Īśvara kī is athāh sṛishṭi men se kisī aur Lōka men. Hōgā voh Lōka bhī aisā hī. Hān, itnā sambhav hai ki vahān dukh kuchh kam hōn." (Page 214)

Translation—

(4) Even this sun has been spoken of at many places in the Brāhmaṇas as *Svarga*—

This Sun is the *Svarga Loka* (Taitt. Brah. 3, 8, 10, 3).

Besides, there are many other things which have been spoken of as *Svarga Loka*. The sense in every case appears to be that a particular kind of happiness has been spoken of as *Svarga Loka*, whether that happiness is enjoyed here on this earth or in some

1. Vide Note 2 on page 26.

other *Loka* in this infinite creation of God. Of course, even that *Loka* would be just like this earth. Yet it is possible that sorrow and grief may be somewhat lesser there. (Page 214).

(5) The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 11—5—1—10 has been quoted and it is stated :—

'पूरुरवा और उर्वशी के (आलंकारिक) संवाद का यह सूक्त पंद्रह ऋचा का है, ऐसा ऋग्वेदीय कहते हैं। परन्तु ऋग्वेद १०-६५ में, जिसके कुछ मंत्र यहाँ उद्धृत हैं, अठारह ऋचा हैं। (पृष्ठ ११)

'Purūravā aur Urvaśī ke (ālankārik) samvāda kā yeh Sūkta pandrah ṛichā kā hai, aisā Ṛigvedīya kahte hain. Parantu Ṛig-Veda 10—95 men, jiske kuchh mantra yahān uddhṛita hain, aṭhārah ṛichā hain.' (Page 11)

Translation—

"People belonging to Schools of Rig-Veda say that this *Sukta* containing the metaphorical discussions between Purūravā and Urvaśī has 15 *Richas*, but there are 18 *Richas* in *Sukta* 10—95 of Rig-Veda of which a few *mantras* are quoted here." (Page 11)

In other words, according to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that *Śukta* of Rig-Veda should have only 15 *mantras*, but now there are 18 *mantras* in it.

(6) Some *Ślokas* from Aitereya Brahmaṇa (8—23) have been quoted and it is stated :—

इन.........श्लोकों में वर्तमान दौष्यन्ति भरत, शतानीक और शकुन्तला नाम स्पष्ट महाभारत-काल से कुछ ही पहले होने वाले व्यक्तियों के हैं। अतः शतपथादि ब्राह्मण महाभारत-काल में ही संकलित हुए, ऐसा मानना युक्तियुक्त है। (पृष्ठ ६७)

"In......Ślōkōn men vartmān Daushyanti Bharat, Śatānīka aur Śakuntalā nām spashṭ Mahābhārata-kāl se kuchh hī pahle hōne

vāle vyaktiyōn ke hain. Atah Śatapathādi Brāhmaṇa Mahābhārata kāl men hī sankalit hue, aisā mānanā yuktiyukta hai." (Page 67).

Translation —

The names 'Dauṣyanti Bharata', 'Śatānīka' and 'Śakuntalā' found in the *ślokas* are clearly the names of persons who existed only some time before the time of Mahābhārata. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that the Brāhmaṇas, Satapatha etc., were edited in the time of Mahābhārata. (Page 67)

(7) After quoting Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 1-3-2-6, the following has been given as its meaning:—

"जो वेद का मल था वह गाथा-नाराशंसी बन गया।" (पृष्ठ १०५)

"Jō Veda kā mal thā voh gāthā-nārāśansī ban gayā." (Page 105)

Translation —

"What was the filth of the *Vedas* became '*Gatha-naraśansi*'[1]."

And it is stated at another place—

"गाथाएँ पौरुषेय हैं। यही पौरुषेय गाथाएँ ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों में अनेक स्थलों पर उद्धृत की गई हैं।" (पृष्ठ १०५)

"Gāthāen paurusheya hain. Yehī paurusheya gāthāen Brāhmaṇa granthōn men anek sthalōn par uddhṛita kī gayee hain." (Page 105)

Translation —

"*Gathas*' are '*paurusheya*'[2], i.e. are made by men. These '*paurusheya gathas*' have been quoted in the Brāhmaṇas at many places". (Page 105)

---

1. The word 'Gāthā' means 'legend' or story. 'Nārāśansi' means that 'which is in praise of men'. The word has been made up from 'Nara' i.e. man and 'Śansī' i.e. that which praises men. 2. 'Paurusheya' means that which pertains to men or has been made by men.

But it is stated in Sukta[1] 6 of Kāṇḍa[2] 15 of Atharva-Veda:—

"उसके पीछे इतिहास, पुराण, गाथा और नाराशंसी चले। ११
वह इतिहास, पुराण, गाथा और नाराशंसियों का प्रिय धाम होता है जो ऐसे जानता है।" १२

"Uske pīchhe Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Gāthā aur Nārāśansī chale. 11
Voh Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Gāthā aur Nārāśansiyōn kā priye dhām hōtā hai jō aise jāntā hai." 12

Translation—

"After that (i.e. after Vrātya[3]) came History, *Puranas*, *Gathas* and *Naraśansi*. (Mantra 11)

He who knows so is the beloved abode of History, *Puranas*[4], *Gathas* and *Naraśansis*. (Mantra 12)

(Vide Page 754 Pt. Raja Ram's Commentary on Atharva-Veda).

(8) After quoting the following authorities from the Śatapatha and Taittirīya Brāhmaṇas, it is stated :—

अथ ह याज्ञवल्क्यस्य द्वे भार्ये बभूवतुः।
मैत्रेयी च कात्यायनी च। (शतपथ १४-७-३-१)
तस्य ह नचिकेता नाम पुत्र आस (तैत्तिरीय ब्राह्मण, ३-११-८-१४)

इन वाक्यों का इतिहास से भिन्न अर्थ हो भी नहीं सकता। और निश्चय ही इन लोगों से पहले ये ग्रन्थ भी न थे। अतएव इतिहासादि युक्त होने से ही इन ब्राह्मणों की भी इतिहासादि संज्ञा अवश्य है।

(पृष्ठ १०६)

"Ath ha Yājñavalkyasya dve bhārye babhūvatuḥ.
Maitreyī cha Kātyāyanī cha. (Śatapatha 14-7-3-1)
Tasya ha Nachiketā nāma putra āsa. (Taitt. Brāh. 3-11-8-14)

---

1. 'Sūkta' means hymn. It has a number of mantras or verses.
2. 'Kānda' literally means the portion of the stalk of a plant from joint to joint. The word is often used for Sections of books as here for Sections of the Atharva-Veda. 3. Pt. Raja Ram does not explain the meaning. Pt. Jaydeva Sharma says the word means 'Prajāpati'. 4. Vide Note 1 on page 22.

In vākyōn kā Itihāsa se bhinn arth hō bhī nahīn saktā. Aur niśchaya hī in lōgōn se pahle ye granth bhī na the. Ataeva Itihāsādi yukta hōne se hī in Brāhmaṇōn kī bhī Itihāsādi sanjña avaśya hai. (Page 109)

Translation —

There were two wives of Yājñavalkya, viz, Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī. (Śatapatha 14—7—3—1)
He had a son by name Nachiketā.
(Taitt. Brāh. 3—11—8—14)

These statements cannot be interpreted otherwise than as historical and admittedly the books also could not have existed before the people who are referred to therein. Thus, because they contain history, the Brāhmaṇas etc. must necessarily be called History." (Page 109)

In other words, in the authority quoted from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, there is clear mention of the two wives ol Yajñavalkya and of their names, Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī. And in the second quotation given above, there is mention of the son, by name Nachiketā. Thus these Brāhmaṇas must necessarily be accepted as books of history and it will have to be admitted that these books were written after those persons whose names are given therein.

23. You may just also know what these Brāhmaṇas are. It is stated on page 55 of the Urdu Edition of the Rig-Vedādi-Bhāshya-Bhūmikā :—

سوال—ویدہ کن کا نام ھے ؟
جواب—منتر سمہتا کا -

Savāl—Veda kin kā nām hai ?
Javāb—Mantra Samhitā kā.

Translation —

Question—What books are known as '*Vedas*'. ?

Answer —Mantra Samhitās are known as *Vedas.*

سوال—کاتیاین رشی کا قول ھے کہ منتر اور براھمن دونوں کا
نام وید ھے - تو اس صورت میں براھمن بھي ویدوں میں کیوں
نہیں مانتے -

جواب— ایسا نہیں کہنا چاھئے کیونکہ براھمنوں کا نام وید
نہیں ھو سکتا - اس میں حسب ذیل دلیلیں ھیں -

Savāl—Kātyāyana Rishi kā qaul hai ki mantra aur Brāhmaṇa dōnōn kā nām Veda hai, tō is sūrat men Brāhmaṇa bhī Vedōn men kyōn nahīn mānate ?

Javāb—Aisā nahīn kahnā chāhiye, kyōnki Brāhmaṇōn kā nām Veda nahīn hō saktā. Ismen hasb zail dalīlen hain :—

(۱) براھمنوں کا نام پران اور اتہاس ھے - (۲) وہ وید کے
ویاکھیان (شرح) ھیں- (۳) ان کے مصنف رشی ھیں- (۴) وہ ایشور
کے بنائے ھوئے نہیں ھیں - (۵) سوائے ایک کاتیاین رشی کے اور
کسی رشی نے انکو وید کے نام میں شامل نہیں مانا - (۶) اُن کي
تحریر انساني عقل کي صنعت، کا نشان دیتی ھے - (۷) جس طرح
براھمنوں میں انسانوں کے دنیوي اتہاس (سوانح) نام سمیت پاے
جاتے ھیں- منتر سمہتاؤں میں ان کا نام و نشان بھی نہیں - وغیرہ

'(1) Brāhmaṇōn kā nām Purāṇa aur Itihās hai. (2) Voh Veda ke vyākhyāna (sharah) hain. (3) Unke musannif Rishi hain. (4) Voh Īśvara ke banāye hue nahīn hain. (5) Sivāye ek Kātāyana Rishi ke aur kisī Rishi ne unkō Veda ke nām men shāmil nahīn mānā. (6) Unkī tahrīr insānī aql kī san'at kā nishān detī hai. (7) Jis tarah Brāhmaṇōn men insānōn ke duniyavī itihās (savānih) nām samet pāye jāte hain, samhitāōn men unkā nām va nishān bhī nahīn, vagairah.'

Translation —

Question—Sage Kātyāyana has stated that both the *Mantras* and the Brāhmaṇas[1] are included in the

---

1. Vide Note 1 on page 35.

Vedas. Under these circumstances why are not the Brāhmaṇas accepted as parts of the *Vedas* ?

Answer—One should not say so because the Brāhmaṇas cannot be said to be the '*Vedas*'. The following are the arguments in support of this :

(1) The Brāhmaṇas are classed as Purāṇas and History ;

(2) They are explanatory commentaries of the *Vedas* ;

(3) Their authors are *Rishis* ;

(4) They have not been revealed by God ;

(5) With the exception of Sage Kātyāyana, no other *Rishi* has included them among the *Vedas* ;

(6) The way they are written gives the indication that they are the product of human intelligence ;

(7) The Brahmaṇas contain some history and the names of persons, but the *Samhita*[1] does not contain any trace of these.

24. It would be clear from the above quotation that Swami Dayanand admits that Sage Kātyāyana believed the Brāhmaṇas to be a part of the *Vedas*. Pandit Nardeva Śāstri has written on page 298 of his book Rigvedālochana :—

स्वामी जी के विषय में एक और आवश्यक बात विचारणीय है। स्वामी जी ने यजुर्वेद भाष्यकार महीधराचार्य, ऋग्वेद भाष्यकार सायणाचार्य आदि के भाष्य का खंडन तो किया किन्तु जिन शतपथादि ब्राह्मणों के आधार और प्रमाणों से वे उस प्रकार का भाष्य करने पर बाध्य हुए उन ब्राह्मणों के विषय में मौन साध लिया—यह आश्चर्य है कि स्वामी जी ने स्पष्टरूप में उन ब्राह्मणग्रन्थों का ही खंडन क्यों नहीं किया। (ऋग्वेदालोचन, प्रथम संस्करण १६२८, पृष्ठ २६८)

1. The mantra text of the Vedas excluding the Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, Upanishads etc.

"Swami ji (Swami Dayanand) ke vishaya men ek aur āvaśyaka bāt vichārṇīya hai. Swami ji ne Yajur-Veda-Bhāshyakār Mahīdharāchārya, Rig-Veda-Bhāshyakār Sāyaṇāchārya ādi ke bhāshya kā khanḍan tō kiyā kintu jin Śatapathādi Brāhmaṇōn ke adhār aur pramāṇōn se ve us prakār kā bhāshya karne par bādhya hue un Brāhmaṇōn ke vishaya men maun sādh liyā—yeh āścharya hai ki Swami ji ne spashṭarūp men un Brāhmaṇa granthōn kā hī khanḍan kyōn nahīn kiyā".

(Rig-Vedālōchana, 1st. Edition, 1928, Page 298)

Translation —

One more important thing pertaining to Swami Dayanand is worth considering. Swami Dayanand criticized the commentaries of Mahidhar, the commentator of Yajur-Veda and Sayaṇacharya, the commentator of Rig-Veda etc. But he kept quite mum regarding the Brāhmaṇas like Śatapatha etc., on the basis and authority of which these commentators felt compelled to interpret the *Vedas* in that manner. It is surprising why Swami Dayanand did not clearly and categorically criticize the Brāhmaṇas also.

25. From the above quotation, it appears that the Brāhmaṇas contain such material with the help of which the commentators wrote their commentaries on the *Vedas* and Swami Dayanand, though he criticized the commentaries of other great persons, did not even say a word against the Brāhmaṇas on the basis of which those commentators wrote their commentaries. On the contrary, it would appear from a study of the books of Swami Dayanand that he referred to the authority of the Brāhmaṇas like *Śatapatha*, etc., in support of his statements at various places

Pandit Bhagavad Datta refers in his History of Vedic Literature (Part II, page 4) to the preface of Bhatta Bahaskar's commentary on the Taittirīya-Samhitā. (1-8-1) :—

"ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों में दो प्रकार के ब्राह्मण होते हैं। एक कर्म ब्राह्मण और दूसरे कल्प ब्राह्मण।......कर्म ब्राह्मण वह है जो केवल कर्मों का

विधान करता है और मंत्रों का विनियोग बताता है। न ही प्रशंसा करता है, न ही निन्दा। कल्प ब्राह्मण में मंत्रों का पाठ मात्र है, विनियोग नहीं।

"Brāhmaṇa granthōn men dō prakār ke Brāhmaṇa hōte hain. Ek Karma Brāhmaṇa aur dūsre Kalpa Brāhmaṇa............ Karma Brāhmaṇa voh hai jō keval karmōn kā vidhān kartā hai aur mantrōn kā viniyōg batātā hai. Na hī praśansā kartā hai, na hī nindā. Kalpa Brāhmaṇa men mantrōn kā pāṭh mātra hai, viniyōg nahīn.

Translation—

There are two kinds of Brāhmaṇas—one, *Karma Brahmanas* and the other, *Kalpa Brahmanas*. *Karma Brahmanas* are those which prescribe the *Karmas*, i. e. the deeds to be performed and indicate the application of *mantras*. They neither praise nor condemn anything. The *Kalpa Brahmanas* give only the reading of the *mantras* and their application is not indicated.

26. Should the helpless Satsangi now accept the Brāhmaṇas as part of the *Vedas* according to the view of *Rishi* Kātyāyana or should he, according to the opinion of Swami Dayanand, accept only the *Samhita* portion as the *Vedas* ? Should he rely on the commentaries of great persons like Sayaṇacharya[1] and others which they wrote on the authority of the *Brahmanas* like Śatapatha etc. on which Swami Dayanand himself relies at different places in his books or should he listen to what Swami Dayanand says ? Should he treat the '*Gathas*'[2] and '*Naraśansi*'[3] as the 'filth' of *Vedas* and creation of man or should he treat them as something written before the *Vedas*, because the Atharva-Veda itself makes a mention of their existence from before ? And if they are the 'filth' of the *Vedas*, why are they considered to be the creation of man ? The 'filth' of the *Vedas* should be a part of the *Vedas* themeslves. First of all, it is impossible

1. Vide Note 3 on page 20. 2. Vide Note 1 on page 38. 3. Vide Note 1 on page 38.

for anyone to find out the real *Vedas*, and if any *Śakha* is accepted as the *Vedas*, it becomes necessary to take help from some commentary in order to understand its meaning. The *Vedas* are said to have 1127 *Śakhas*. Which *Śakha* should one rely on and which commentator's interpretation should one accept ? And the trouble is that the number of the commentators is not one or two, nor five or six. It appears from the History of Vedic Literature that the number of the commentators is also unusually large. Names of some of the commentators are given below :—

Commentators of Rig-Veda

(1) Skandaswāmī, (2) Nārāyaṇa, (3) Udgītha, (4) Hastāmalaka, (5) Venkaṭa Mādhava, (6) Lakshmaṇa, (7) Dhānushkayajvā, (8) Ānanda Tīrtha, (9) Ātmānanda, (10) Sāyaṇa, (11) Rāvaṇa, (12) Mudgala, (13) Chaturvedaswāmī, (14) Devaswāmī, (15) Bhatta Bhāskar, (16) Uvvata, (17) Har Datt, (18) Sudarśana Sūri, (19) Dayānand Saraswatī.

Commentators of Yajur-Veda

(1) Śāunaka, (2) Hariswāmī, (3) Uvvata, (4) Gauradhara, (5) Rāvaṇa, (6) Mahīdhara, (7) Dayanand Saraswatī.

Commentators of Sama-Veda

(1) Mādhava, (2) Bharataswāmī, (3) Sāyaṇa, (4) Sūryadaivjña, (5) Mahāswāmī, (6) Śobhākara Bhatt, (7) Guṇa-vishṇu.

Commentators of Atharva-Veda

(1) Sāyaṇa, (2) Pandit Rajaram.

In addition to the commentators mentioned above, there are fourteen more commentators of the Kāṇva Samhita[1] and the Taittirīya Samhitā[2].

1. The Vedic text of Śukla Yajur-Veda according to the Kāṇva School. 2. The Vedic text of Kṛishṇa Yajur-Veda according to the Taittirīya School.

27. Some people believe that the large number of the *Śakhas* of the *Vedas*, viz. 1127, is due to difference in their readings and some others say that these *Śakhas* are due to the difference in the teaching imparted in different centres of education. In both the cases, it is not possible for any man to study all the *Śakhas*.

28. Besides, Sanskrit scholars also have not held similar opinions regarding the *Vedas* from very ancient times. Thus the following five Schools of thought are quite well known :—

(i) Brahmavādīs – Those who believe the *Vedas* to be eternal, i.e. without a beginning and not written by men;

(ii) Yājñikas—Those who believe the *Vedas* to be the authority for *yajnas*;

(iii) Vaijñānikas—Those who believe the *Vedas* to be simple scientific books;

(iv) Aitihāsikas—Those who believe the *Vedas* to be the history of the civilization of the Aryans of ancient times;

(v) Nāstikas—Those who hold the opinion that the *Vedas* are mere collections of meaningless words and expressions.

Without the least doubt, this difference of opinion creates another great difficulty for the helpless Satsangis.

29. The Vedic commentaries easily available these days generally consider the meaning of the Yājñika School as the best. Thus, Nardeva Śāstri writes in his book 'Rig-vedālochana' (1st Edition, 1928):—

इस समय वेदों को ईश्वरीय ज्ञान मानने वालों के सम्मुख वेदों का ऐसा कोई भाष्य नहीं है कि जिसको देख कर मनु-निर्दिष्ट उन उच्च वेदों की कल्पना की जा सके। याज्ञिक भाष्य वेदों को उस उच्च स्थान पर ले जाकर बैठाने में असमर्थ हैं।

(ऋग्वेदालोचन, प्रथम संस्करण, पृष्ठ १६८—१६६)

"Is samaye Vedōn kō Īśvarīya jñāna mānane vālōn ke sammukh Vedōn kā aisā kōyee bhāshya nahīn hai ki jiskō dekh kar Manu-nirdishṭa un uchcha Vedōn kī kalpanā kī jā sake. Yājñika bhāshya Vedōn kō us uchcha sthān par le jā kar baiṭhāne men asmarth hain." (Ṛig-Vedālōchana, 1st Edition Pages 198-199)

Translation —

At this time, there is no commentary of the *Vedas* available to those who believe the *Vedas* to be divine revelation, on seeing which one could form an idea about the highly respected *Vedas* as Sage Manu appears to have indicated. The Commentaries belonging to the Yajnika School are incapable of setting the *Vedas* on that high pedestal.

(Rigvedālochana 1st. Edition, Pages 198— 199)

And regarding the commentary of Swami Dayanand, Pandit Nardeva *Śastri* writes in Part I of his book 'Ārya Samāj kā Itihas':—

सायणाचार्यादिकों की विद्वत्ता के विषय में सन्देह करना मानो अपनी अज्ञता प्रकट करना है। उनके (स्वामी दयानन्द के) भाष्य को देखने से जैसा वह सुसंगत, सुसम्बद्ध प्रतीत होता है वैसा दूसरा प्रतीत नहीं होता। यह ठीक है कि प्रथा नई है, आधार तर्कशिला है, कार्य नया है, सयुक्तिक, सोपपत्तिक है, पर सन्तोषजनक नहीं।.........सारांश भाष्य ऐसा नहीं बना जो संसार पर धाक बैठती।........." वेदभाष्य केवल पाण्डित्य के बल पर नहीं बनेगा। किन्तु तपोबल की भी आवश्यकता है। सो हमारे मण्डल में इस तपोबल का शशशृंगवत् नितान्त अभाव है। पुरानी चार्वाकीय स्पिरिट गई, पर नई और उससे भी दृढ़ चार्वाकीय स्पिरिट आई। केवल तर्क से ही संसार को वश में करने की इच्छा करने वाले भूलते हैं। तर्क भी श्रद्धा विहीन होने से अत्यन्त हानि का कारण होता है।......स्वामी जी आये, गये, बड़ा काम कर गए। प्रसुप्त भारत को प्रबुद्ध भारत कर गए। यह सब कुछ हुआ सही। पर स्वामी जी ने किसी शास्त्र पर कोई अद्भुत भाष्य क्यों नहीं लिखा, जिससे संसार चकित रह जाता। शाङ्कर भाष्य

की दहल देखिये। इसी प्रकार का भाष्य लिख जाते तो संसार भर के विद्वानों पर युगयुगान्तर तक धाक बैठ जाती। (पृष्ठ १९५—१९६)

"Sāyaṇāchāryādikōn kī vidvatā ke vishaya men sandeh karnā mānōn apnī ajñatā prakaṭ karnā hai. Unke (Swami Dayanand ke) bhāshya kō dekhne se jaisā voh susangat, susambaddh pratīt hōtā hai vaisā dūsrā pratīt nahīn hōtā. Yeh ṭhīk hai ki prathā nayee hai, ādhār tarkśilā hai; kārya nayā hai; sayuktik, sōpapattik hai, par santōsh-janak nahīn.........Sārānś, bhāshya aisā nahīn banā jō sansār par dhāk baiṭhtī............Vedbhāshya keval pānḍitya ke bal par nahīn banegā, kintu tapōbal kī bhī āvaśyakatā hai, sō hamāre manḍal men is tapōbal kā śaśaśṛingavat nitānt abhāv hai. Purānī chārvākīya spirit gayee par nayee aur us se bhī dṛiṛh chārvākīya spirit āyee. Keval tark se hī sansār kō vaś men karne kī ichchhā karne vāle bhūlte hain. Tark bhī śraddhā-vihīn hōne se atyant hāni kā kāran hōtā hai.........Swami ji āye, gaye, baṛā kām kar gaye. Prasupt bhārat kō prabuddh bhārat kar gaye. Yeh sab kuchh huā sahī par Swami ji ne kisī Śāstra par kōyee adbhut bhāshya kyōn nahīn likhā, jis se sansār chakit rah jātā. Shānkar bhāshya kī dahal dekhiye. Isī prakār kā bhāshya likh jāte, tō sansār bhar ke vidvānōn par yugayugāntar tak dhāk baiṭh jātī." (Page 195—196).

Translation —

If one entertains doubts regarding the learning of Sāyaṇāchārya and others, he simply exposes his own ignorance. When one sees the commentary of Swami Dayanand, it appears to be quite consistent and systematic and no other commentary appears to be like it. Of course, it is correct that a new method has been adopted in the commentary, but it is based on reason. The new work has been done in quite a new way and is well-argued and based on reason, but not satisfactory. The conclusion is that the commentary of Swami Dayanand is not such as could win praise for itself in the world. The commentary of the *Vedas* cannot be written merely on the strength of one's book-knowledge alone ; it also requires at least some spiritual development but our society lacks it completely just as a hare is lacking in horns. The old spirit of

Chārvāka[1] has disappeard, but a new and stronger spirit of a similar type has manifested itself. Those who want to control the entire world by means of reason are mistaken. Reason unaccompanied by faith often results in great harm. Swami Dayanand came to this world and left the world; he did really great work and he awakened India which was fast asleep, but it is not understood why Swami Dayanand did not write some wonderful commentary on some *Śastra* so that the world might have been astonished? What a high position is occupied by the commentary of *Śankara*[2]! If Swami Dayanand had also written some such commentary, his position could have been established among the learned people of the world for centuries to come." (Pages 195, 196).

30. Pt. Nardeva Śāstri writes in Part II of the same book regarding the present condition of the Arya Samaj :—

सामाजिक सिद्धान्त वेदों के बजाय कम समझ लोगों की बुद्धि पर निर्भर होने लगे। वेदज्ञ विद्वानों की जगह अंग्रेज़ीख़्वाँ पार्टी ने ले ली। .... सन्ध्या अग्निहोत्र आदि पंच महायज्ञ, संस्कार और वेदों में कथन मात्र की श्रद्धा अवशिष्ट रह गई। .... असंस्कृतज्ञ लोगों को आचार्य पद्वी मिलने लगी। स्त्रियाँ पुरुषसमाज को उपदेश देने लगीं। अग्निहोत्र हवा में झाड़ू लगाने के लिए और संस्कार दिखलाने के लिए अश्रद्धापूर्वक होने लगे। वेदों का मान

---

1. 'Chārvāka' was an atheist. It is not known when he actually lived. He did not believe in 'Ātmā', but thought that consciousness is engendered in man as a result of the combination of the elements, viz, earth, water etc. and the end comes when these elements disperse. It is said that his philosophy is expounded in Bārhaspatya Sūtras and in Sarva-Darśana-Sangraha. 2. Śankarāchārya is the founder of the Advaita philosophy. He was born in South India in 788 A.D. and he died in 820 A.D. at the age of 32 years. He wrote commentaries on Upanishads and Vedānta Sūtras. He roamed all over India challenging Buddhists to debate. As a result, Buddhism almost disappeared from India.

बराय नाम शेष है। प्रत्येक आर्य सभासद् अपनी बुद्धि के आधार पर अपने सिद्धान्त क़ायम कर सकता है। साङ्गोपाङ्ग वेदों का पढ़ना तो दूर रहा, स्वरसहित वेद पाठ करने वालों का भी अभाव सा हो गया है।........स्वामी जी महाराज के ग्रन्थों और उनके निर्धारित सिद्धान्तों का मान्य घट रहा है। अश्रद्धा और अविश्वास की लहर बढ़ रही है। मग़रबी तालीम और उसके प्रभाव के बहाव में आर्य-समाज डूब रहा है। वैदिक सभ्यता और वैदिक शिक्षा पर पानी फिर रहा है।........आर्य सिद्धान्त वेद-शास्त्र न जानने वाले लोगों के वोट द्वारा निर्णय होते हैं।........सच्चे साधु और योगियों का अभाव ही समझना चाहिए।" (पृष्ठ २७३—२७४)

'Sāmājik siddhānt Vedōn ke bajāye kam-samajh lōgōn kī buddhi par nirbhar hōne lage. Vedjña vidvānōn kī jagah angrezīkhān parṭī ne le lī............Sandhyā, agnihōtra ādi panch mahāyajña, samskār aur vedōn men kathan mātra kī śraddhā avaśishṭ rah gayee............Asanskṛitajña lōgōn kō āchārya padvī milne lagī. Striyān purusha-samāj kō updesh dene lagīn. Agnihōtra havā men jhāṛū lagāne ke liye aur samskār dikhlāne ke liye aśraddhāpūrvak hōne lage. Vedōn kā mān barāye nām sesh hai. Pratyek Ārya sabhāsad apnī buddhi ke ādhār par apne siddhānt qāyam kar saktā hai. Sāngōpāng vedōn kā paṛhnā tō dūr rahā, svar-sahit vedapāṭh karne vālōn ka bhī abhāv sā hō gayā hai..............Swami ji Maharaj ke granthōn aur unke nirdhārit siddhāntōn kā mānya ghaṭ rahā hai. Aśraddhā aur aviśvās kī lahar baṛh rahī hai. Maghrabī tālīm aur uske prabhāv ke bahāo men Ārya Samāj ḍūb rahā hai. Vaidik sabhyatā aur vaidik sikshā par pānī phir rahā hai.............. Ārya-sidhānt Veda-śāstra na jānane vāle lōgōn ke vōṭ-dvārā nirṇaye hōte hain. ....Sachche sādhu aur yōgiyōn kā abhāv hī samajhnā chāhiye."

Translation —

The principles of Arya Samaj now depend not on the *Vedas,* but on the intelligence of people of little wisdom. The place occupied in Society by Vedic scholars has now been usurped by the English-knowing

people. Faith in *Sandhya*[1], *Agnihotra*[2] etc. and in *Panch Mahayajna*[3], *Samskaras*[4] and the *Vedas* is now only nominal. Those who do not even know Sanskrit are given the title of *Acharya*. Ladies have begun to give lectures to males. *Agnihotra* is done for cleansing the air but without any faith and the *samskaras* are performed just for show. Honour is shown to the *Vedas* merely as a formality. Every member of the Arya Samaj can lay down rules of conduct for himself according to his own intelligence. What use is it to lament the absence of people who may have studied the *Vedas* and all their *Angas*[5] and *Upangas*[6] when even people who may chant the *Vedas* with correct pronunciation and intonation are almost unavailable! The respect for the books of Swami Dayanand and principles established by him is gradually decreasing everyday. A wave of disbelief and scepticism has set in. The Arya Samaj is sinking fast in the flood of Western education and its influence and Vedic civilization and the Vedic system of education are going to dogs. The principles of Arya Samaj are now decided in accordance with the votes given by people who do not know the *Vedas* and the *Śastras*. True *Sadhus* and *Yogis* also are almost non-existent.

(Pages 373 and 374).

You yourself may now consider how could faith and

---

1. Vide Note 4 on page 18. 2. Vide Note 3 on page 26. 3. Swami Dayanand has prescribed 5 Yajñas for followers of the Vedic religion. These are known as ऋषियज्ञ (Rishi Yajña), देवयज्ञ (Deva Yajña), पितृयज्ञ (Pitṛi Yajña), बलिवैश्वदेव यज्ञ (Balivaiśvadeva Yajña), and अतिथियज्ञ (Atithi Yajña). 4. Vide Note 2 on page 1. 5. Angas (i.e. parts) of the Vedas are said to be six, viz, Śikshā (Science of proper pronunciation), Chhand (Prosody), Vyākaraṇa (Grammar), Nirukta (Explanation of Vedic words), Jyōtish (Astronomy and Vedic Calendar) and Kalpa (Vedic ceremonial and rules of ritual etc.). These are also often called Vedāngas. 6. Upāngas include the Śāstras etc. e.g. Nyāya, Mīmānsā etc. and Dharma-śāstras e.g. Manusmṛiti etc.

belief in the *Vedas* and in the teachings of Swami Dayanand exist in the minds of people of the world in general when the condition of the devotees of the *Vedas* and the lovers of the *Vedic Dharma* and those who praise the recent researches of Swami Dayanand is as bad as is described above.

31. *Question.* Why do you mention others ? You should speak for yourself. Others may have or may not have faith ; you at least should have faith. What is your own opinion in the matter ?

Answer. In my opinion, the *Vedas* exist in three forms, first in the form of books, secondly in the form of words used in the *Vedas* and thirdly in the form of knowledge contained therein. It is meaningless for the individual who does not show proper reverence to the *Vedas* in the form of knowledge to honour the *Vedas* in the first two forms and the *Vedas* in the third form i.e. the *Vedas* in the form of knowledge can be properly honoured only when the real meanings of the words of the *Vedas* are known. Regarding the real meanings, Swami Dayanand has stated :—

"जिस जिस मन्त्रार्थ का दर्शन जिस ऋषि को हुआ और प्रथम ही जिसके पहले उस मंत्र का अर्थ किसी ने प्रकाशित नहीं किया था, किया और दूसरों को पढ़ाया भी। इसलिए अद्यावधि उस उस मंत्र के साथ ऋषि का नाम स्मरणार्थ लिखा आता है। जो कोई ऋषियों को मंत्रकर्त्ता बतलावें उनको मिथ्यवादी समझें। वे तो मंत्रों के अर्थ प्रकाशक हैं।" (सत्यार्थप्रकाश, तेरहवाँ हिन्दी संस्करण, पृष्ठ २१४)

"Jis jis mantrārth kā darśan jis Ṛishi kō huā aur pratham hī jiske pahle us mantra kā arth kisī ne prakāśit nahīn kiyā thā, kiyā, aur dūsrōn kō paṛhāyā bhī, is liye adyāvadhi us us mantra ke sāth Ṛishi kā nām smaraṇārth likha ātā hai. Jō kōyee Ṛishiyōn kō mantra-kartā batlāven unkō mithyāvādī samjhen. Ve tō mantrōn ke arthprakāśak hain."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa 13th. Hindi Edition, Page 214)

Translation—

"The names of *Rishis* written along with *mantras* of the *Vedas* even till today are of those *Rishis* to whom the meanings of the *mantras* were revealed for the first time and who taught those meanings to others as well and prior to whom nobody else had explained these meanings. Whosoever considers the *Rishis* to be the writers of the *mantras*, should be taken as a liar. The *Rishis* were only the revealers of the meanings of the *mantras*." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, page 214).

In other words, the meanings of some *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed only to some *Rishis* in the past. These *Rishis* told these meanings to others and thus the world came to know the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas*. The names of such *Rishis* are written along with the *mantras* of the *Vedas* for the information of people in general even till today.

32. First, the general custom everywhere in the world is that the name of the writer is written along with the name of the book and not of the translator. Thus the probability is that the *Rishis* whose names are written with the *mantras* may be the authors of those *mantras*. Secondly, should it not be concluded from this statement of Swami Dayanand that those *Rishis* also did not attain complete knowledge of the *Vedas*; for God revealed the meanings of only a limited number of *mantras* to each of those *Rishis*. Thirdly, now that Swami Dayanand has found out the real meanings of a large number of *mantras* of *Vedas*, would the Arya Samaj now score out the names of the *Rishis* of the past from the *mantras* of the *Vedas* and arrange to print the name of Swami Dayanand along with those *mantras*, particularly because it is meaningless to stick on to the names of the *Rishis* of the past when the meanings revealed to them have already disappeared. The name of that person alone who gives the correct

meaning of the *mantras* to the world should appear along with the *mantras*. And fourthly, even if the statement of Swami Dayanand be accepted as correct, it will have to be conceded that only those meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are correct which were revealed by God to certain particular *Rishis* in the beginning of the creation and as no book or writing of those *Rishis* is available in the world at present, therefore, as long as it is not established that the meanings offered by any particular person have been received through a person acquainted with those *Rishis* or through some disciple of theirs or directly from God Himself, the meanings given by him would be but the product of his own imagination. Moreover, it is not stated in any book of the Arya Samaj that the meanings which have been given by Swami Dayanand to the *Veda mantras* in his *Bhashya* were obtained from any direct disciple of the *Rishis* of the past or directly from God Himself, but on the other hand, it is stated in the Rigvedadi-Bhashya-Bhumika, under the heading 'Tafsir Hāzā ki zarūrat par bahas" : —

سوال—آپ کوئي نئي تفسیر لکھتے ھیں یا جو تفسیر قدیم
آچاریہ لکھ چکے ھیں اُسی کو بیان کرتے ھیں - اگر پرانی تفسیر
کو بیان کرتے ھیں تو بمصداق آنکہ پسے کو پیسنا فضول ھے -
کوئی بھی اسکو نہیں مانیگا -

"(Savāl)—Āp kōyee nayee tafsīr likhte hain yā jō tafsīr qadīm āchārya likh chuke hain, usī kō bayān karte hain ? Agar purānī tafsīr kō bayān karte hain, tō bamisdāq ān ki 'pise kō pīsnā phazūl hai', kōyee bhī iskō nahīn mānega."

Translation —

Question. 'Are you writing a new commentary or are you simply re-stating and explaining the commentaries of the ancient sages ? If you are only stating what has already been stated in the past, then according to the saying 'it is waste of time to do a thing already done', nobody would accept it.'

جواب—قدیم آچاریوں کی کی ہوئی تفسیر کو ظاہر کیا
جاتا ہے - جو قدیم عالموں یعنی برہما سے لیکر یاگیہ ولکیہ -
واتسیاین اور جیمنی تک رشیوں نے ایتریہ اور شت پتھ وغیرہ
تفسیریں لکھی ہیں نیز پانِنی - پتنجلی اور یاسک وغیرہ
مہرشی لوگ جو ویدوں کے مضامین کی تشریح ویدانگ کے نام
سے کر چکے ہیں - نیز جیمنی وغیرہ رشیوں نے جو ویدوں کے
اُپانگ یعنی چھہ شاستر لکھے ہیں اور جو اُپوید اور ویدوں
کی شاکھائیں بنائی جا چکی ہیں اُنہیں سے اِنتخاب کرکے سچے
معنی کو ظاہر کیا جاتا ہے - کوئی نئی بات بلا حوالے اپنی طرف
سے نہیں لکھی جاتی - (صفحہ ۲۰۰ پہلا اُردو ایڈیشن)

Javāb.—Qadīm āchāryōn kī kī huyī tafsīr kō zāhir kiyā jātā hai, jō Qadīm 'ālimōn yānī Brahmā se lekar Yājñavalkya, Vātsyāyana aur Jaiminī tak Ṛishiyōn ne Aitereya aur Śatapatha vagairah tafsīren likhī hain nīz Pāṇini, Patanjali aur Yāska vagairah Maharshi lōg jō Vedōn ke mazāmīn kī tashrīh vedāng ke nām se kar chuke hain, nīz Jaimini vagairah Ṛishiyōn ne jō vedōn ke upāng yānī chheh Śāstra likhe hain aur jō Upaveda aur Vedōn kī Śākhāyen banāyee jā chukī hain, unhīn se intakhāb karke sachche mānī kō zāhir kiyā jātā hai. Kōyee nayee bāt bilā havālā apnī taraf se nahīn likhī jātī."

(Page 200, First Urdu Edition)

Translation —

The commentaries written by the Ācharyas of the past are explained here. The correct meaning of the *Vedas* is being given here after making selections from the commentaries which have been written by the ancient learned Sages from Brahmā down to Yajñavalkya, Vātsayāna and Jaimini etc. in Aitereya and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas etc. and also from the explanations of the text of the *Vedas* offered by the Sages Pāṇini, Pātanjali and Yāska, etc., and known as Vedāngas[1] and also the Upāngas[2] i.e. the six Śāstras written by Rishi Jaimini and others and the

1. Vide Note 5 on page 51. 2. Vide Note 6 on page 51.

Upavedas[1] and the *Śakhas*[2] of the *Vedas* etc. It is after making a selection that the commentary is written. Nothing new is being written here without proper references. (Page 200—First Urdu Edition)

It is thus clear that Swami Dayanand has not written anything new or anything specially authoritative in his commentary, as he had no special inspiration from God. Like a learned scholar and a person devoted to God, he wrote his commentary with the help of his learning and intelligence and after studying Aitereya and Śatapatha *Brahmanas* and the *Darśanas* etc. And as (as has already been stated) these *Brahmanas* and *Darśanas* were written at the time of Mahābhārata or after it, evidently therefore Swami Dayanand did not get any help from those *Rishis* on whom, according to Swami Dayanand himself, the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed first of all. If somebody says that the meanings given in the *Brahmanas* are exactly word for word the same as were revealed to *Rishis* in the beginning of the creation and that Swami Dayanand has not deviated from the explanations given therein even in the least but has followed the same word by word, his commentary can then certainly be called as an inspired one. But as has been stated already in para 23, Swami Dayanand considered the *Brhamanas* to be work of human beings and he clearly refused to accept them as having been revealed by God or to treat them as being equal to the *Vedas*. He simply accepted them as History or *Puranas*.

33. Besides, it is also believed that each *Śakha* of the *Vedas* had a separate *Brahmana* of its own and therefore there should be 1131 *Brahmanas* for 1131 *Śakhas*. But

1. The Upavedas are :—Āyur-veda (Science of medicine), Dhanur-veda (Science of archery), Gandharva-veda (Science of music) and Śastra-Śāstra (Science of arms) etc. Two more are also often included in Upavedas and are Sthāpatya-veda (Science of architecture) and Śilpa-Śāstra (Sculpture). 2. Vide Note 3 on page 29.

only a few of these *Brahmanas* are now available; the rest have perished and even in the case of those that are available, many portions of their text have been polluted, some portions have been lost and some interpolations also have been made and so far nobody has made any attempt to put right the text of the *Brahmanas*. (Vide page 163, History of Vedic Literature Part II)

34. You may now see how far the research of Swami Dayanand has been correct. His statement is that the *Rishis* whose names are written along with the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were not the authors of those *mantras* but that they only explained the meanings thereof. But there are a few such *Suktas* also in the *Vedas* in which it is clearly stated that the author of the particular *Sukta* is so-and-so, son of so-and-so, vide Rig-Veda[1] 1-60-5, 10-63-17 and 10-67-1. In some other *Suktas* it is stated that those particular *Suktas* have been inserted at the inspiration of gods Indra, Varuṇa, Soma, Aditi etc. For example, see 1-37-4, 2-32-2, 7-66-11, 8-59-6, 10-72-1, 10-88-8 and 10-90-9. And many learned scholars believe that *Rishis* had some inspiration or intuition within themselves and they gave expression to that inspiration or intuition in the form of the *mantras* of the *Vedas*. In addition to this, the words 'स्तोमं जनयामि नव्यम्' ('Stomam[2] janayāmi navyam') i.e. 'I give birth to a new hymn in praise of gods' are given in Rig-Veda 1-109-2. This clearly shows that the author of this *mantra* is some individual and not God. In the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad 6-2-2 also, the words 'अपि हि न ऋषेर्वचः श्रुतम्' ('Api hi na Rishervachah śrutam) i.e. 'Did you not hear the words of the *Rishi*?' are given and *mantra* 15 of Rig-Veda *Mandala* 10, *Sukta* 88, has been quoted which again clearly shows that the *Rishi*

1. All these references of mantras given here have been taken from the book Rigvedālōchana by Pt. Nar Deva Śāstri (pages 61-62). 2. The word 'stōma' means a hymn which is in praise of some god or gods or God.

who was the author of Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad believed that the author of this *mantra* was a *Rishi*[1].

35. Besides, it is generally believed that the '*Nirukta*' of Sage Yaska[2] is a very old book. It is held in great esteem by the students of *Rig-Veda*. It is generally said that there were many other *Niruktas* prior to this *Nirukta* but they have all been lost now. The present *Nirukta* is based on the *Nighantu*. Therefore, like the *Niruktas*, there were many *Nighantus* as well which have since been lost. There is 'detailed explanation of the meanings of the *Vedas* in the *Nirukta*' and 'the *Nighantu* is an example of an old Vedic Dictionary'[3]. The opinions of *Yajnikas* and Historians have been criticized at some places in the *Nirukta* and in some places the *Nirukta* has kept quiet so as to favour these two kinds of interpretations. It is at least clear from this that during the life-time of the author of the *Nirukta* different schools, viz, *Yajnikas*, Historians, *Brahmavadis* and Atheists propagated their opinions regarding the interpretation of the *Vedas* with considerable force.

36. Now when it is admitted that there are 1131 *Śakhas* of the *Vedas* and every *Śakha* has its own separate *Nirukta* and *Nighantu*, and also its own separate Brahmaṇa and all these books interpret the *mantras* of the *Vedas* differently because the beliefs of their authors are different, it is merely

---

1. The mantra in original is :—

द्वे सृती अशृणवं पितृणामहं देवानामुत मर्त्यानाम्

Dve sṛitī aśṛiṇavam pitṛiṇāmaham devānāmuta martyānām

Translation—

I have heard of two paths for mortals i. e. one, of the pitṛis or manes and the other, of gods.

Note—Only one line of the mantra has been given to save space.

2. Yaska is the author of the Nirukta, an explanatory commentary on the difficult words of the Vedas contained in the Vedic glossary, Nighanṭu. 3. For these opinions regarding Nirukta and Nīghanṭu see page 132 of 'History of Vedic Literature' by Pt. Bhagavad Datta, 1st Edition, 1927.

a matter of partiality for any person to say that the commentary of Swami Dayanand is superior to every other commentary.

37. Swami Dayanand holds that there is no mention of historical events or personalities in the *Vedas*, for otherwise the *Vedas* will be proved to be the work of man. But if one refers to *Śutra* 1-1-30 of *Vedanta Darśana*[1], one must conclude that the view of Swami Dayanand is not correct. The *Sutra* of the *Vedanta Darśana* is :—

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् । १—१—३०

'Śāstradṛishṭyā tūpadeśō Vāmadevavat.' 1 —1— 30

Translation —

Looked at from the view-point of the *Śastras* the statement has been made just as Vāmadeva[2] did before this.

In their commentary on this *Sutra*, Swami Śankarāchārya[3] and Pt. Raja Ram have written that Sage Vyāsa[4] wrote this *Śutra* on the authority of Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad[5] 1-4-10. The relevant portion of the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad is :—

तद्धैतत् पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदे 'अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चे'ति । १—४—१०

Taddhaitat paśyannṛishirvāmadevaḥ pratipede,
'Aham Manurabhavam Sūryaśch'eti. 1— 4— 10

---

1. Vedānta Darśana (or Vedānta Sūtras) is one of the 6 Darśanas which represent the six systems of Indian philosophy. This is also known as Uttara Mīmānsā and also merely as Vedānta. 2. An ancient Sage of Vedic times. He is the author of hymns comprising nearly the whole of Maṇḍala 4 (Sūktas 1 to 41 and 45 to 48). 3. Vide Note 2 on page 49. 4. 'Bādarāyaṇa' Vyāsa is the famous author of the Vedānta Darśana. He is believed to have lived between 800 and 600 B. C. 5. Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad forms the last 6 Adhyāyas of the Śatapatha Brahmaṇa. As this Brahmaṇa pertains to the Sūkla Yajur-Veda, this Upanishad is also connected with it. It is one of the ten principal Upanishads.

Translation —

Thus when *Rishi* Vāmadeva saw this, he admitted, "I was once Manu: I was once the sun".

In this extract from the *Upanishad* there is a clear reference and indication about *Rig-Veda* 4-3-26(1). The *mantra* of the *Rig-Veda* is:—

अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चाहम् कक्षीवाँऋषिरस्मि विप्रः ।
अहं कुत्समार्जुनेयन्यृञ्जे अहं कविरुशना पश्यता मा ॥

Aham Manurabhavam Sūryaśchāham Kakshīvānṛishiraṣmi vipraḥ,
Aham Kutsamārjuneyanyṛiñje aham kaviruśanā paśyatā mā.

Translation —

I was once Manu[1], I was once the sun;
I was the sage and seer Kakshīvān[2].
I was Ārjuneya Kutsa[3] who ever strove to attain the Ideal;
I was the poet Uśanā.[4]

In this quotation of *Rig-Veda*, Vāmadeva has spoken about himself that 'he once became Manu, then he became the sun' etc. As a matter of fact, it is written in the Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇopanishad that King Pratardan on showing bravery and valour in the battle-field attained the pleasant Abode of God Indra. God Indra desired him to ask for some boon. The King replied, 'Kindly tell me whatever you consider best for men'. Indra said, 'Listen, I am *Prana*, Intelligence personified. Consider me to be the Vital Force and *Amrita*[5] and worship me.' On this statement of the *Upanishad*, a question has been raised. 'What is the meaning here of the word *Prana*? Is it breath, *Jivatma*, Lord Indra or Para-

1. 'Manu' is the name of the Progenitors of creation. It is said that the Progenitor of the present creation is Vaivasvata Manu, who is the seventh Manu. 2. A famous Rishi who was author of many hymns. 3. Name of another famous Rishi, son of Arjuna. He is also author of many hymns of Rig-veda. 4. Another ancient Rishi. 5. i.e. Immortality.

Brahma ?' Vyasa answers this question in the *Vedanta Darśana* and says that the word '*Prana*' means Para-Brahma. Then another question is raised that in case the word '*Prana*' here means *Para-Brahma*, why did Indra then advise, 'Worship me' ? Why did he not suggest the worship of *Para-Brahma* ? In reply to this question, Vyasa refers to *Sutra* 30 and says that from the point of view of the *Śastras*, this statement has been made in the same manner and sense as Vāmadeva once spoke. In other words, this statement has not been given from the worldly point of view but it has been given from the point of view of the *Śastras* alone. The *Śastras* tell us that the manifestation of all the powers chiefly depends on *Para-Brahma* and that He is the soul of all souls. In support of his answer, Vyasa says. "Vāmadeva-vata" i.e. "As in the case of Vāmadeva", and then refers to the words of *Rishi* Vāmadeva and shows that just as in *Rig-Veda* (4-3-26) Vāmadeva used First Person pronoun for himself and said, "I was Manu, I was the sun", similarly, God Indra also speaks here. The subject matter of this *mantra* of the *Rig-Veda* has been discussed in detail in Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad 1-4-10. The *Rishi* who was the author of that *Upanishad* believed that in particular circumstances, a god or *Rishi* or man becomes entitled to say, "I am Brahma". Therefore, after referring to the *mantra* of the *Rig-Veda* quoted above, the *Rishi* says :—

"Truly speaking, He was *Brahma* in the very beginning. But only later on He came to know that He was *Brahma* and therefore He said, 'I am *Brahma*'. Thus He became everything. In this way, whosoever from among the gods got 'awakened' i.e. whose ignorance was removed became '*Brahma*'. Similarly, from amongst *Rishis* and also from amongst men whosoever got awakened, became *Brahma*. Thus when *Rishi* Vāmadeva saw this, He felt that, 'He had been Manu, and that He had been the sun'. And thus if any person even now feels and knows that he is *Brahma*, he actually becomes all this. And even the gods

feel impotent to restrict his status, because he then becomes the soul of these gods. Now if somebody worships some other god, thinks that the god worshipped by him is different and he, the worshipper, is different from that god, he does not know the reality. He is like a beast of burden for the gods. And just as there are many animals who contribute to the maintenance of one single person, similarly a single person contributes to the maintenance of many gods. Now if only one animal belonging to a person is stolen, the latter feels annoyed. What will be his condition if many animals are stolen? Similarly the gods do not like that man should be able to know all this'.[1]

38. From this statement of the *Upanishads*, not only is it established that, in the *mantra* of the *Rig-Veda* referred to above, historical account of *Rishi* Vāmadeva[2] has been given, but also that the Aryans used to worship gods like

1. This entire passage which is so illuminating is the translation of Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (1-4-10). The passage in original is not reproduced here, being too long. 2. There is mention in the Vedas not only of Ṛishi Vāmadeva alone, but also of Chyavana, Kaṇva, Viśvāmitra and many other Ṛishis and similarly of Khela, Viśapalā, Parikshit and other kings and also of the Ganges, the Yamunā, the Saraswatī, the Beas and other rivers. Here we made a mention of Ṛishi Vāmadeva alone for the reason that the Ṛishi who wrote the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad and Sage Vyāsa who is the author of Vedānta Sūtras also interpret the aforesaid mantra of the Ṛig-Veda in the same manner as we have done and therefore no person will dare say that the meaning of the word Vāmadeva is something different and it does not refer to a particular Ṛishi. There is mention of King Khela and Viśapalā in Manḍala 1 Sūkta 116, of Ṛig-Veda and of Ṛishi Viśvāmitra and river Beas and Śatadru in Manḍala 3 Sūkta 33, of Ṛig-Veda and of King Parikshit in Sūkta 127, Kānḍa 23 of Atharva-Veda. It is stated regarding King Parikshit, "As soon as the Most Excellent King Parikshit ascended the throne, he made every one happy, so said Kaurvyapati (who was building his house) to his wife" (Mantra 8). "What thing should I bring for you—curd, butter-milk or juice?—a wife enquired from her husband in the kingdom of Raja Parikshit" (Mantra 9). (Vide page 993, Atharva-Veda Bhāshya by Pt. Raja Ram). The original text is given on next page at bottom.

Indra and others in addition to *Brahma Purusha*. Readers may here consider that if some history of *Rishi* Vāmadeva[1] is really given in the *Vedas* and if the statement of the *Rishi* who wrote the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad carries any weight and if Vyāsa, the author of *Vedanta Darśana*, was conversant with the *Vedas*, then it is established, as against the opinion of Swami Dayanand, that the *Vedas* are the writings of men and that there are also such gods in the creation as are desirous of making others worship them, and further that in ancient times, the worship of gods was prevalent. In that case, who were those *Rishis* from Brahma down to Jaimini whose statements were before Swami Dayanand when he wrote his commentary of the *Vedas* and which *Śakhas* of the *Vedas* were those which were available to Swami Dayanand but which are not available now? Further, which are those *Upangas* (i.e. the six *Darśanas*) of the *Vedas* which do not include the *Vedanta Darśana* ?

---

1. This same Ṛishi Vāmadeva says in Mantra 13, Sūkta 18, Manḍala 4 of Ṛig-Veda that once he cooked the meat of a dog when he was in trouble, but that Indra assumed the form of a hawk and snatched it away and did not allow him to eat it. The text in original is given below :—

अवर्त्या शुन आन्त्राणि पेचे न देवेषु विविदे मर्डितारम् ।
अपश्यं जायाममहीयमानामधामे श्येनो मध्वाजभार ॥ ४—१८—१३

Avartyā śuna āntrāṇi peche na deveshu vivide marḍitāram,
Apaśyam jāyāmamahīyamānāmadhāme śyenō Maghvājabhāra.
4—18—13

Please refer to the last line of Notes on preceding page for the text given below :—

परिक्षिन्नः क्षेममकरुत्तम आसनमाचरन् । कुलायं कृण्वन् कौरव्यः पतिर्वदति जायया ॥ ८॥
कतरत् त आ हराणि दधि मन्थं परि स्रुतम् । जाया पतिं विपृच्छति राष्ट्रे राज्ञः परिक्षितः ॥ ९ ॥

Parikshinnah kshemamakaruttama āsanamācharan,
Kulāyam kṛiṇvan kauravyah patīrvadati jāyayā. 8
Katarat ta ā harāṇi dadhi mantham pari śrutam,
Jāyā patim vipṛichchhati rāshṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitah. 9

IV

SWAMI DAYANAND

39. *Question*. But be a little patient. Members of the Arya Samaj consider Swami Dayanand a perfect *Yogi* and a *Maharshi*[1] and his investigations and research, deep and thorough.

Answer. There is no doubt that Swami Dayanand was a very learned man and a patriot of his time, and the services that he rendered to the Hindu public are innumerable but one feels constrained to state with regret that most of his investigations and his research are not such as could be accepted without demur and as the word of an *Apta Purusha*[2]. Of course it would be very unfair and ungrateful if in view of the mistakes that he made, his great services to the country are not acknowledged. And as a matter of fact when Swami Dayanand had no revelation internally nor did he get any opportunity to receive scientific education, it could not naturally be expected that his researches would be free from mistakes. The time when he was educated was a period of complete ignorance. He searched for a Satguru in mountains and forests, but was unsuccessful. Ultimately, he became a disciple of Shri Virijanand who was a learned scholar of those days but his subject was only grammar. Can a person well-versed in grammar be also well-versed in *paramartha*? Nature had endowed Swami Dayanand with a heart which was full of patriotism and he was born in a country where those who posed as monoplists of religion misguided the people and put them on the highway to hell as far as their

1. Great Ṛishi or Great Sage. 2. The word 'Āpta' (आप्त) is from Sanskrit verb 'आप्' (Āp), 'to reach', 'to arrive at one's aim' etc. Obviously, the word 'Āpta' would refer to a person who has attained his aim. Generally, the word is taken to mean credible and authoritative persons, e.g. Ṛishis, incarnations etc.

worldly and spiritual progress was concerned and nobody had the courage to speak a word against the great fraud they had spread. And in those days, it was impossible for the people even to see the *Vedas*, what to say of reading them or listening to them. Living under such circumstances, how could any person howsoever enthusiastic and patriotic he may be, possibly make any research or investigation all by himself ? Everybody knows that when Swami Dayanand spoke boldly against the harm done by idol-worship, not a single responsible person from amongst the Hindu public came forward for a long time to join him in this matter. When he reached Kashi (Banaras), the Pandits and other people of the place instead of listening attentively to his lectures and arguments began to shower abuses on him and throw brickbats at him. And what happened at Kashi happened in every city and village to which he went. Ignorant people created a lot of meaningless furore and questions were put to him in such quick succession that the scene of a rainy day in the month of August was as nothing compared to it. How could he reply to all questions quickly and according to the *Śastras* ? He therefore sometimes gave a reply suited to the time and occasion and sometimes according to his views and principles and on some occasions he said whatever came to his mind on the spur of the moment. For example, when he went to Mirzapur, a man, Ram Gopal Vaish by name, said that he had read many commentaries of the Gita, but his doubts about the *śloka* given below had not been satisfied.

सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज ।
अहं त्वाम् सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥

'Sarvadharmān parityajya māmekam śaraṇam vraja,
Aham tvām sarvapāpebhyō mōkshayishyāmi mā śuchaḥ.'

Translation —

Give up all your *dharmas* and take protection under me. I shall free you from all sins. You need not be anxious on that account.

Swami Dayanand referred to the rule of grammar, 'शकन्ध्वादिषु पररूपं वाच्यम् (Śakandhvādishu pararūpam vāchyam')[1] and explained that according to this *Varttika*'[2], the a (अ) coming after va (व) merged into it. The result was that the form in which the word has been left is 'Dharma' (धर्म) though really the word was 'adharma', and hence the meaning would be 'adharma' and not 'dharma''. The man was delighted and asked for authority in support of the interpretation. Swami Dayanand quoted two or three *mantras* of the *Vedas* as authority. Obviously, this reply of Swami Dayanand would surprise everybody. Most probably no commentator has ever interpreted this *śloka* in this manner, and in spite of the fact that this authority of Swami Dayanand was there, no Ārya Samājist scholar has dared so far to translate the word '*sarvadharman*' (i.e. all duties) as '*sab adharma*' (i e. all sins). And it would not be wrong to say that if this meaning of the *śloka* as given by Swami Dayanand is accepted, not only the teaching contained in this *śloka* but the entire teaching contained in the *Gita* would be reduced to nullity.

40. Before giving the meaning of this *śloka* it appears desirable that readers should be told that this *śloka* is the life and soul of the Bhagwad Gita. It is the 66th *śloka* of Chapter 18. Even earlier i.e. in *śloka* 64[3], Lord Krishna

1. According to the usual rules of Sanskrit grammar, when अ (a) is followed by अ (a), आ (ā) takes the place of both. Hence if the two words सर्व (sarva) and अधर्म (adharma) are put together, they would become सर्वाधर्म (sarvādharma). The rule quoted by Swami Dayanand refers to some exceptions in which अ (a) followed by अ (a) are not substituted by आ (ā) but one अ (a) is dropped. Thus instead of 'sarvādharmān', we will have 'sarvadharmān'. Strictly, the exception does not cover this case. 2. Vārttikas are Kātyāyana's critical annotations on Paṇinis' grammar. These occasionally modify or provide exceptions. In this Vārttika, exceptions have been pointed out. 3. The text in original Sanskrit is :—

सर्वगुह्यतमं भूयः शृणु मे परमं वचः ।
इष्टोऽसि मे दृढमिति ततो वक्ष्यामि ते हितम् ॥ १८—६४

Sarvaguhyatamam bhūyah sṛiṇu me paramam vachaḥ,
Ishṭōsi me dṛiḍhamiti tatō vakshyāmi te hitam. 18—64

Himself emphasized the importance of this *śloka*. It is stated there, "Listen to My most important Message once more. It is the most secret thing. Since I love you from my heart, I repeat it once more for your benefit". After these preliminary remarks, begins the most important Message of Lord Krishna and it is stated in *ślokas* 65 and 66. The message runs :—

अपने मन को मुझ में गला दो। मेरे भगत बनो, मेरी पूजा करो। मुझे नमस्कार करो। तुम जरूर मुझसे वासिल होगे। मैं तुम्हें अपना बचन देता हूँ; तुम मेरे प्यारे हो। (६५)

"Apne man kō mujhmen galā dō. Mere bhagat banō, merī pūjā karō. Mujhe namaskār karō. Tum zarūr mujh se wāsil hōge. Main tumhen apnā bachan detā hūn ; tum mere pyāre hō." (65)

Translation —

Merge yourself in me. Become my devotee. Worship me. Salute me. You would certainly attain me. I give you my word. You are dear to me.[1] (65)

Thereafter begins the *śloka* under discussion, the clear meaning of which is given below :—

Give up all your duties and take protection under me. I shall free you from all sins. You need not be anxious on that account.

41. As has been stated in the first chapter of the Bhagvad Gītā, Arjuna was reluctant to fight against his relations and dear ones, because he thought it would not be in conformity with his duty. He said that he would not like to shed the blood of his elders and dear ones even for securing

1. The text in original Sanskrit is :—

मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां नमस्कुरु।
मामेवैष्यसि सत्यम् ते प्रतिजाने प्रियोऽसि मे॥ १८—६५

Manmanā bhava madbhaktō madyājī mām namaskuru,
Māmevaishyasi satyam te pratijāne priyōsi me. 18—65

the kingdom of all the three worlds, what to say of ruling over this earth. The result of all this killing and blood-shed would be that our family would be destroyed. When the family is destroyed, the old religion of the family coming down from ancient times is also destroyed; and when this is destroyed, ladies, children and old people who are left behind fall a prey to 'adharma' i.e. irreligious or immoral conduct. And it is heard about such people that they are sent to hell to live there for ever. Lord Krishna, after satisfactorily disposing of all the doubts and suspicions of Arjuna, gave his great Message at the end. And that great Message and teaching was: "Be my devotee, depend upon me and giving up all other duties, take only my protection. I promise that if in fighting in obedience to my command you become liable for doing any sinful act, I shall free you from that sin. You need not worry on that account." Now if the word '*adharma*' is substituted for the word '*dharma*', the meaning would be that if Arjuna gave up all *adharma* and took protection of Lord Krishna, he would be released from all sins. What an absurd meaning! When Arjuna has given up all '*adharmas*' or sins, from which sins would Lord Krishna then release him? For the information of the readers, the meaning of the *śloka* under discussion is given from the books of other commentators :—

सब धर्मों को छोड़ कर तू केवल मेरी ही शरण में आ जा। मैं तुझे सब पापों से मुक्त करूँगा, डर मत।

(लोकमान्य तिलक : गीता रहस्य,तृतीय हिन्दी संस्करण, पृष्ठ ८४७)

(1) "Sab dharmōn kō chhōṛ kar tū keval merī hī śaran men ā jā. Main tujhe sab pāpōn se mukt karūngā, ḍar mat."
('Gita-Rahasya' by Lokamanya Tilak, 3rd Hindi Edition, Page 847).

Translation—

Leave off all duties and take only my protection. I shall free you from all sins. Do not be afraid.
(Gita-Rahasya by Lokamanya Tilak, 3rd Hindi Edition, page 847)

(2) "Abandoning all duties (*Dharmas*) come unto Me alone for shelter ;

Sorrow not, I will liberate thee from all sins."
(Bhagvad-Gita by Mrs. Annie Besant).

हे अर्जुन ! वेद विरोधी सब धर्मों को छोड़ कर मेरी एक वैदिक धर्म रूपी शरण को प्राप्त हो। ऐसा करने पर मैं तुमको सब पापों से छुड़ा दूँगा, शोक मत कर। (पं० आर्यमुनि का अनुवाद)

(3) "He Arjun ! Vedavirōdhī sab dharmōn kō chhōṛ kar merī ek vaidik-dharma-rūpī śaran kō prāpt hō. Aisā karne par main tumkō sab pāpōn se chhuṛā dūngā, śōk mat kar."
(Pt. Āryamuni kā Anuvāda).

Translation —

O Arjun, give up all duties which are opposed to the *Vedas*, take shelter under me as it it were taking shelter under *Vedic Dharma*. When you do so, I shall free you from all sins. Do not be grieved over it.
(Translation by Pandit Āryamuni)

सारे धर्मों को त्याग कर अकेली मेरी शरण ले, शोक मत कर, मैं तुझे सारे पापों से छुड़ाऊँगा।
(पं० राजाराम : भगवद्गीता भाष्य, प्रथम संस्करण, पृष्ठ ४३६)

(4) "Sāre dharmōn kō tyāg kar akelī merī śaraṇ le, śōk mat kar, main tujhe sāre pāpōn se chhuṛāūngā."
(Bhagvadgītābhāshya by Pandit Rajaram, 1st Edition, Page 439).

Translation —

Leaving off all duties, take shelter only under me. Do not be sorry, I shall free you from all sins.
(Bhagvad-Gītā-Bhāshya by Pt. Raja Ram, Page 439).

Pandit Raja Ram has given a note under this *śloka* in his Bhāshya, in which he has referred to the meanings given

by Śankarāchārya, Ramānujāchārya and other great personalities. That note is also worth reading. It reads as below :—

अर्जुन के लिए उपदेश में यह अन्तिम श्लोक है, इसका आशय श्री शंकराचार्य ने यह लिया है कि कर्म सारे त्याग कर केवल परमात्मज्ञान में तत्पर हो। परमात्मा तुझे सारे पापों अर्थात् पाप पुण्यों से छुड़ाएँगे, बन्धन से मुक्त करेंगे। श्री रामानुज ने यह आशय लिया है कि कर्मों में आसक्ति और फल का त्याग ही पूर्व (१८।६) त्याग कह आए हैं। यहाँ धर्मों के त्याग से यह तात्पर्य है कि कर्मों में आसक्ति और फल को त्याग कर केवल ईश्वर-परायण हो। इस तरह बर्तने से परमात्मा सारे संचित पापों से तुझे छुड़ा लेंगे। श्री माधव ने लिखा है कि धर्म के त्याग से अभिप्राय फल के त्याग से है, अन्यथा युद्ध का विधान कैसे होता।

"Arjuna ke liye updeś men yeh antim Ślōka hai, iskā āśaya Śri Śankarāchārya ne yeh liyā hai ki karma sāre tyāg kar keval Paramātmajñāna men tatpar hō, Paramātmā tujhe sāre pāpōn arthāt pāp puṇyōn se chhuṛāyenge, bandhan se mukta karenge. Śri Rāmānuja ne yeh āśaya liyā hai ki karmōn men āsakti (bandhan) aur phal kā tyāg hī pūrva (Adhyāya 18, Ślōka 9) tyāg kah āye hain. Yahān dharmōn ke tyāg se yeh tātparya hai ki karmōn men āsakti aur phal kō tyāg kar keval Īśvar-parāyaṇa hō, is tarah bartane se Paramātmā sāre sanchit pāpōn se tujhe chhuṛā lenge. Śri Mādhava ne likhā hai ki dharma ke tyāg se abhiprāya phal ke tyāg se hai, anyathā yuddh kā vidhān kaise hōtā."

Translation —

This is the last *śloka* of Lord Krishna's address to Arjuna. The meaning of this *śloka*, as given by Śankarāchārya[1], is : "Give up all *karmas* or actions and engage yourself in gaining knowledge of God. God will release you from all sins, i.e. from all good and bad actions, and will free you from all bonds and ties."

---

1. Vide Note 2 on page 49.

Shri Rāmānuja'[1] has given the following meaning :— Renunciation of "attachment to *karmas* and the results thereof has been described previously (Chap. 18, *Śloka* 9) as renunciation. Here the meaning of the words 'giving-up the duties' is that there should be no attachment either to the actions or to the results thereof and the devotee should merge himself in God. If one behaves like this, God will free him from all accumulated sins." Shri Mādhvāchārya[3] has said that the expression 'give up *dharmas*' means "the giving up of the results of actions', otherwise how would fighting be justified etc. etc.

In short, the substitution of the word '*dharma*' by the word '*adharma*' in this *śloka* appears to be quite unsuitable and the interpretation of '*dharma*' as '*adharma*' as Swami Dayanand has done, has not been given in any of the commentaries referred to above. However, this is a small matter. We now proceed to mention some other things about the knowledge and researches of Swami Dayanand, which would make it quite clear that our opinion about Swami Dayanand is not just a product of imagination.

V

EXAMPLES OF RESEARCHES AND KNOWLEDGE OF SWAMI DAYANAND

42. Western scholars and, on the authority of their writings, Christian priests too had confused the Hindu public

1. Sri Rāmānuja or Rāmānujāchārya was born in South India in 1073 A.D. and passed away in 1194 A.D. at the age of 121. He is the Founder of the Viśishṭādvaita School of Vedānta. He wrote commentaries on the Gita and the Vedānta Sutras and also wrote three other books.
2. Śri Madhvāchārya was born in South India in the 12th Century A.D. He taught bhakti of Vishnu. He wrote a commentary on the Gita.

by stating that it would not be justifiable and correct to say that the *Vedas* were books lacs of years old when the creation itself was only about five to seven thousand years old. Swami Dayanand gave a detailed account of the origin of the creation in Rigvedādi Bhashya Bhūmikā and tried to silence the critics. Accordingly, it is written on page 14 of the Urdu Edition of the aforesaid book that, according to Swami Dayanand, 1,96,08,52,976 years had passed till 1876 since the creation came into existence, but the translator of the Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā wrote on page 5 of his preface to the book that this calculation of Swami Dayanand was wrong because he had omitted to add up the time of seven *sandhis*[1], i.e. 1,20,96,000 years. According to astronomical calculations, the age of this earth in 1876 comes to 1,97,29,48,076 years. Therefore on the books published by the Arya Samaj, the Arya Sambat (Aryan Era) is written according to this calculation, i.e. after adding up the period of the seven *sandhis*.

43. Westerners repeatedly asked Indians to show where description or account of modern discoveries and inventions, like electricity, balloons etc. could be found in the *Vedas*, in case the *Vedas* were really the fountain-head of all knowledge. Hindus went to learned *pandits* and enquired from them about this, but the *pandits* had no answer. The result was that most of the educated Hindus lost faith in the *Vedas* and the rest were worried as to what reply should be given to the critics. Swami Dayanand realized this difficulty of his countrymen and placed before the public certain *mantras* of the *Vedas* which, according to him, contained some description of the principles of telegraphy and of the knowledge about ships, balloons, etc.

---

1. Sandhi means a period occurring at the expiration of each Yuga or age, equivalent to one-sixth of the duration of the Yuga and intervening before the commencement of the next. Sandhis also occur at the end of each Manvantara and Kalpa.

Accordingly the translation of those *mantras* has been given on pages 123 to 128 of the Urdu translation of the Rigvedādi-Bhāshya-Bhūmikā. But when one reads through the translation given there, one gets quite different feelings. For example, one *mantra* is given below :—

युवं पेद्वे पुरुवारमश्विना स्पृधां श्वेतं तरुतारं दुवस्यथः ।
शर्य्यैरभिद्युं पृतनासु दुष्टरं चर्कृत्यमिन्द्रमिव चर्षणीसहम् ॥ १०

Yuvam pedave puruvāramaśvinā spridhām śvetam tarutāram duvasyathaḥ
Śaryyairabhidyum pṛitanāsu dushṭaram charkṛityamindramiva charshaṇīsaham. 10

(Rig-Veda Mandala 1, *Sukta* 119, *Mantra* 10)

The translation of this *mantra* in the Hindi Edition of Rigvedādi-Bhāshya-Bhūmikā is given as below :—

(युवं पेद्वे०) अभिप्रा :—इस मंत्र से तारविद्या का मूल जाना जाता है । पृथिवी से उत्पन्न धातु तथा काष्ठादि के यन्त्र और विद्युत् अर्थात् बिजली, इन दोनों के प्रयोग से, तारविद्या सिद्ध होती है क्योंकि 'द्यावापृथिव्योरित्येके' इस निरुक्त के प्रमाण से इनका अश्वि नाम जान लेना चाहिए । (पेद्वे) अर्थात् वह अत्यन्त शीघ्र गमनागमन का हेतु होता है, (पुरुवारम्) अर्थात् इस तार विद्या से बहुत उत्तम व्यवहारों के फलों को मनुष्य लोग प्राप्त होते हैं, (स्पृधाम्) अर्थात् लड़ाई करने वाले जो राज पुरुष हैं उनके लिए यह तार विद्या अत्यन्त हितकारी है । (श्वेतं०) वह तार शुद्ध धातुओं का होना चाहिए, (अभिद्युम्) और विद्युत् प्रकाश से युक्त करना चाहिए । (पृतनासु दुष्टरम्) सब सेनाओं के बीच में जिसका दुःसह प्रकाश होता और उल्लंघन करना अशक्य है, (चर्कृत्यम्) जो सब क्रियाओं के बारंबार चलाने के लिए योग्य होता है । (शर्य्यैः) अनेक प्रकार कलाओं के चलाने से अनेक उत्तम व्यवहारों को सिद्ध करने के लिए विद्युत् की उत्पत्ति करके उसका ताड़न करना चाहिये । (तरुतारम्) जो इस प्रकार का ताराख्य यन्त्र है उसको सिद्ध करके प्रीति से सेवन करो । किस प्रयोजन के लिए ?—(पेद्वे) परम उत्तम व्यवहारों की सिद्धि के लिए, तथा दुष्ट शत्रुओं के पराजय और श्रेष्ठ पुरुषों के विजय के लिए तारविद्या सिद्ध करनी चाहिए ।

(चर्षणीसहं) जो मनुष्यों की सेना के युद्धादि अनेक कार्यों को सहन करने वाला है। (इन्द्रमिव) जैसे समीप और दूरस्थ पदार्थों का प्रकाश सूर्य्य करता है वैसे तारयंत्र से भी दूर और समीप के सब व्यवहारों का प्रकाश होता है। (युवं) (दुवस्यथः) यह तारयंत्र पूर्वोक्त अश्वि के गुणों ही से सिद्ध होता है। इसको बड़े प्रयत्न से सिद्ध करके सेवन करना चाहिए। इस मंत्र में पुरुष व्यत्यय पूर्वोक्त नियम से हुआ है अर्थात् मध्यम पुरुष के स्थान में प्रथम पुरुष समझना चाहिए। इति तारविद्यामूलं संक्षेपतः

ऋग्वेदादि भाष्यभूमिका, तृतीय संस्करण (हिन्दी पृष्ठ २०६-२१०)

Bhāshārtha

(Yuvam pedave) abhiprāya.—Is mantra se tārvidyā kā mūl jānā jātā hai. Pṛithivī se utpann dhātu tathā kāshṭhādi ke yantra aur vidyut arthāt bijlī, in dōnō ke prayōg se, tārvidyā siddh hōtī hai kyōnki 'Dyāvāpṛithivyōrityeke' is Nirukta ke pramāṇa se inkā aśvi nām jān lenā chāhiye. (Pedave) arthāt voh atyant śīghra gamanāgaman kā hetu hōtā hai, (puruvāram) arthāt is tārvidyā se bahut uttam vyavahārōn ke phalōn kō manushya lōg prāpt hōte hain, (spṛidhām) arthāt laṛayee karne vāle jō Rāj Purush hain unke liye yeh tārvidyā atyant hitkārī hai. (Śvetam) voh tār śuddh dhātuōn kā hōnā chāhiye, (abhidyum) aur vidyut prakāsh se yukta karnā chāhiye. (Pṛitanāsu dushṭaram) sab senāōn ke bīch men jiskā dussah prakāsh hōtā aur ullanghan karnā aśakya hai, (charkṛityam) jō sab kriyāōn ke bārambār chalāne ke liye yōgya hōtā hai. (Śaryyaiḥ) anek prakār kalāōn ke chalāne se anek uttam vyavahārōn kō siddh karne ke liye vidyut kī utpaiti karke us kā tāṛan karnā chāhiye. (Tarutāram) jō is prakār kā tārākhya yantra hai uskō siddh karke prīti se sevan karō. Kis prayōjan ke liye ?—(Pedave) param uttam vyavahārōn kī siddhi ke liye tathā dushṭ śatruōn ke parājaya aur śreshṭha purushōn ke vijaya ke liye tārvidyā siddh karnī chāhiye. (Charshaṇīsaham) jō manushyōn kī senā ke yuddhādi anek kāryyōn kō sahan karne vālā hai. (Indramiva) jaise samīp aur dūraśtha padārthōn kā prakāsh sūryya kartā hai vaise tāryantra se bhī dūr aur samīp ke sab vyavahārōn kā prakāsh hōtā hai. (Yuvam) (duvasyathah) yeh tārayantra pūrvōkta aśvī ke guṇōn hī se siddh hōtā hai. Iskō baṛe prayatna se siddh karke sevan karnā chāhiye. Is mantra men purushavyatyaya pūrvōkta niyam se huā hai arthāt Madhyam Purush ke sthān men Pratham Purush samajhanā chāhiye.

Iti tārvidyāmūlam sankshepataḥ.

Ṛigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, 3rd Edition (Hindi) Pages 209-210

Translation—

The basis of telegraphy can be known from this *mantra*. The instruments made from metals got out of the earth and timber etc. and electricity are the two things by the use of which the science of telegraphy achieves its results, because on the authority of the *Nirukta* contained in the words द्यावापृथिव्योरित्येके ('dyāvāprithivyorityeke'), the names of these things should be known as 'aśvi'. (पेद्वे—pedave) It becomes the medium of quick transmission; (पुरुवारम्—puruvāram) men get results of good trade transactions with the help of this telegraphy; (स्पृधाम्—spṛidhām) and Government officers who have to do fighting get many advantages from telegraphy. (श्वेतं—śvetam) The wire should be of pure metal. (अभिद्युम्—abhidyum) The wire should be supplied with electric current. (पृतनासु दुष्टरम्—pritanāsu dushṭaram) Electricity produces unbearable light between the different armies, beyond which it is impossible to go; (चर्कृत्यम्—charkrityam) and it is suitable for carrying on all activities again and again. (शर्य्यैः—śaryyaih) For the purposeful carrying on of all trade and commerce and for carrying on all arts, electricity should be produced and then it should be put into use. (तरुतारम्—tarutāram) The telegraphic instrument as described above should be completed and brought into man's service and should be put to use with the object (पेद्वे—pedave) of achieving good results of trade transactions and defeating the troublesome enemies and also of securing victory of good people. चर्षणीसहम् (charshaṇisaham) This telegraphy helps the armies in their battles and their other activities. (इन्द्रमिव—Indramiva) Just as

1. The words referred to here occur in Nirukta (12-1) which explains the word 'Āśvinau'. The phrase means that some people take 'Āśvinau' as meaning heaven and earth. As a matter of fact, 'Āśvinau' are two gods who were believed to precede the dawn.

the Sun lights up all the objects, whether they be far or near, in the same manner, telegraphy also brings to light the activities of man, whether they be in far off lands or near at home. (युवं—yuvam) (दुवस्यथः—duvasyathah) This telegraphy is made use of successfully on account of the qualities of *Aśvi* referred to above. This should be put into operation with great care and used for man's needs. In this *mantra* the change of Person from the 2nd Person to the 3rd Person has been effected according to the rule 'Dyāvāpṛi', etc. referred to above.
(Rig-Ved. Bhā. Bhūmikā, 3rd Hindi Edi. Pp. 209-210)

44. The learned translator has introduced many new things which do not exist in the original and has thus made an attempt to show that the *mantra* in the Urdu Edition also contained the subject of telegraphy. The following passage is from the Urdu Edition :—

اے انسانو ! اشون یعنی معدنیات ارضی اور حرارت سے بہت
سے عالموں کے کام میں آنے والی نہایت اعلیٰ صفات سے پر اور آگ
کی خاصیت والی صاف دھاتوں سے پیدا ہونے والی بجلی کا شرارہ
یا رو پیدا کرنا چاہئے اور اسکو محکمۂ جنگی کے کاروبار میں
غیرموصل اشیاء کے ذریعہ سے ہر قسم کے کام کے لئے استعمال کرنا
چاہئے - اور تار کے یندر (آلہ برقی) کو بنانا چاہئے - اس بجلی
میں ضرب کرنے اور حرکت دینے کی صفت ہوتی ہے اور اس سے
بڑے بڑے عمدہ اور اعلیٰ کام نکلتے ہیں - یہ لڑنے والے دشمن کو
شکست دینے اور اپنی فوج کے بہادروں کو فتح حاصل کرانے میں
نہایت کارآمد ہے - فوج کے لوگوں کا سب کام اسی سے چلتا ہے -
سورج کی طرح دور بیٹھے ہوئے لوگوں کو حالات کی اطلاع
پہونچانے کے لئے اشون یعنی معدنیات ارضی اور بجلی کو ٹھیک
ٹھیک استعمال میں لانا چاہئے اور تار یندر (آلہ برقی) کے
استعمال سے ہمیشہ فائدہ اُٹھانا چاہئے -
(رگویداد بھاشیہ بھومکا اردو ایڈیشن اول صفحہ ۱۲۸)

"Ai insānō ! aśvin yānī mādaniyāt arzī aur harārat se bahut se 'ālimōn ke kām men āne vālī nihāyat 'ālā sifāt se pur aur āg

kī khāsiyat vālī sāf dhātuōn se paidā hōne vālī bijlī kā śarārā yā rau paidā karnā chāhiye aur uskō mahkamā jangī ke kārōbār men gairmūsil ashiyā ke zariye se har qism ke kām ke liye istemāl karnā chāhiye. Aur tār ke yantra ('ālā barqī) kō banānā chāhiye. Is bijlī men zarab karne aur harkat dene kī sifat hōtī hai aur is se baṛe baṛe umdā aur 'ālā kām nikalte hain. Yeh laṛne vāle dushman kō shikast dene aur apnī fauj ke bahādurōn kō fateh hāsil karāne men nihāyat kārāmad hai. Fauj ke lōgōn kā sab kām isī se chaltā hai. Sūraj kī tarah dūr baiṭhe huye lōgōn kō hālāt kī ittilā pahunchāne ke liye aśvin yānī mādaniyāt arzī aur bijlī kō ṭhīk ṭhīk istemāl men lānā chāhiye. Aur tār yantra ('ālā barqī) ke istemāl se hameśā fāyedā uṭhānā chāhiye.
(Ṛig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā 1st. Urdu Edition, Page 128)

Translation—

O human beings, you should produce from the metals found in the earth and from heat the spark and the current of electricity which is useful to scientists and which possesses very good qualities and also the characteristics of fire and which is produced from pure metals and you should use it for every kind of work in the military department with the help of non-conductor things. And you should also manufacture the apparatus for telegraphy. This electricity has the quality of striking as well as of imparting motion, and very many good things of a high order can be accomplished with its help. This is extremely useful in defeating the enemy who may come to fight and in gaining victory for the brave soldiers of our own armies. All the work of the army is carried on with this. You should make proper use of minerals obtainable from the earth and also electricity in order to send information to people who are stationed at great distances like the sun. And you should always derive benefit from the use of telegraphic apparatus.
(Rigved. Bhā. Bhūmikā, 1st Urdu Edi., Page 128)

It is worth noticing that in the Hindi Edition the word '*aśvi*' has been interpreted to mean the sky and the

earth on the authority of the Nirukta, but when the meanings are explained in detail, the word is taken to mean the instruments made of metals obtained from the earth and of timber as well as electricity which is produced from the sky. And actually there is no word in Hindi which may mean a non-conductor. And the funniest thing is that quite a different meaning has been given to this *mantra* in the Rig-Veda Bhāshya of Swami Dayanand. The meaning given in the Rig-Veda Bhāshya, which follows, may also be seen :—

"हे (अश्विना) सब विद्याओं में व्याप्त सभा सेनाधीशो (युवम्) तुम दोनों (पेदवे) पहुँचने व जाने को (स्पृधाम्) शत्रुओं को ईर्षा से बुलाने वालों की (पृतनासु) सेनाओं में (चर्कृत्यम्) निरन्तर करने के योग्य (श्वेतम्) अत्युद्गमन करने को बढ़े हुए (पुरुवारम्) जिससे कि बहुत लेने योग्य काम होते हैं (दुष्टरम्) जो शत्रुओं से दुख के साथ उलाँघा जा सकता (चर्षणीसहम्) जिससे मनुष्य शत्रुओं को सहते जो (शर्य्यैः) तोड़ने फोड़ने के योग्य पेचों से बाँधा व (अभिद्युम्) जिसमें सब ओर बिजली की आग चमकती उस (इन्द्रमिव) सूर्य के प्रकाश के समान वर्तमान (तरुतारम्) सन्देशों को तारने अर्थात् इधर उधर पहुँचाने वाले तार यंत्र को (दुवस्यथः) सेवो (१०)

(ऋग्वेदभाष्य सं० १९०४ संस्करण. पृष्ठ २११५-२११६)

"He (Aśvinā), sab vidyāōn men vyāpta sabhā-senādhīśō! (yuvam) tum dōnō (pedave) pahunchane vā jāne kō (spṛidhām) śatruōn kō īrshā se bulāne vālōn kī (pṛitanāsu) senāōn men (charkṛityam) nirantar karne ke yōgya (śvetam) atyudgaman karne kō baṛhe hue (puruvāram), jis se ki bahut lene yōgya kām hōte hain (dushṭaram), jō śatruōn se dukh ke sāth ulānghā jā saktā (charshaṇīsaham) jis se manushya śatruōn kō sahte (śaryyaih), jō tōṛne phōṛne ke yōgya pechōn se bāndhā va (abhidyum) jismen sab ōr bijlī kī āg chamaktī, us (Indramiva) sūrya ke prakāśa ke samān vartmān (tarutāram), sandeshōn kō tārne arthāt idhar udhar pahunchāne vāle tāryantra kō (duvasyathah) sevō." (10)

(Ṛigveda Bhāshya, 1904 Edition, Pages 2115-2116)

Translation —

"O (अश्विना, Aśvinā) Presidents and Commanders of the Army who are conversant with all the sciences !

Both of you should, for (पेद्वे—pedave) reaching the (पृतनासु - pṛitanāsu) armies of (स्पृधाम्—spṛidhām) enemies called by jealous people and moving forward to fight, make use of the telegraph apparatus (चर्कृत्यम् —charkṛityam) which should be constantly used.(पुरुवारम् —puruvāram), which helps, in doing many useful things for men, which (दुष्टरम्—dushṭaram) can be jumped over by the enemy only with great difficulty, which (चर्षणीसहम् —charshaṇīsaham) makes people deal properly with enemies, which is tied up into one whole by screws and (शर्य्यैः—śaryyaih) can be opened up into parts, and (अभिद्युम् —abhidyum) in which electric light shines on all sides, which pervades (इन्द्रमिव—Indramiva) like the light of the sun and which conveys messages in different directions. You should use the apparatus for sending messages to different places.

(Rigveda Bhāshya, 1904 Edition, Pages 2115-2116)

45. Readers must have observed that the word '*aśvina*' has been taken in the commentary as meaning: 'Sab vidyāon men vyāpta sabhā-senādhīśo' "Lords of the Assembly and the Army who are well-versed in all the sciences, i.e. Presidents and the Commanders-in-Chief, who are experts in all the sciences." How could the helpless Satsangi have kept quiet ? This is *mantra* 10 of *Sukta* 119 of the Rig-Veda. In the beginning of the *Sukta*, the words '*Aśvinau devate*' occur, which obviously indicate that the Deities of this *mantra* are the '*Aśvins*'. Moreover, in the very beginning of the commentary, the following words have been given as the heading :—

"अब एकसौ उन्नीसवें सूक्त का आरम्भ है। इसके प्रथम मंत्र में परस्त्री पुरुष कैसे अपना बर्ताव बरतें, यह उपदेश किया है।"

Ab ek sau unnīsaven Sūkta kā ārambh hai. Iske pratham mantra men parstrī purusha kaisē apnā bartāv barten, yeh upadeśa kiyā hai.'

Translation —

Now begins the 119th *Sukta*. In the first *mantra* of this *Sukta*, instructions have been given as to how men should behave towards wives of others.

If anybody reads this heading, he would feel that if the subject matter of the *mantras* pertains to the Deities of the *mantras*, in that case, the subject matter of the *mantras* of this *Sukta* should be '*Aśvini*'; and therefore the word '*Aśvini*' gains much importance as far as the interpretation of this *mantra* is concerned. But Swami Dayanand in his *Bhumika* has taken this word to mean, "the metals obtained from the earth and electricity from the sky" and in his commentary on the *Vedas*, he has taken the word to mean "the President and the Commander-in-Chief". Is there not a lot of difference between the two meanings? The seventh word in this *mantra* is 'tarutāram'. It appears that on seeing the word 'tār', the idea of telegraph occurred to Swamiji but learned scholars of Sanskrit should say whether the word 'tār' in Sanskrit really has this meaning. As far as the present writer knows, the word 'tār' in Sanskrit means 'tārnewālā', i.e. 'one who helps in going across'. Can any gentleman show by reference to the Nirukta or the Nighaṇṭu, to which two books Swami Dayanand refers again and again, that the meaning of the word 'tār' in Sanskrit is 'metallic wire ?

46. Besides, where have the principles of telegraphy been described in this *mantra*? Does God wish that electricity should be used only for operations or activities of the military department? Or does electricity possess only those qualities which Swami Dayanand has enumerated in his commentary? Swami Dayanand has kindly given the substance of this *mantra* after his commentary. It should be read to find out whether God, by means of this *mantra* had really taught the science of telegraphy or something else.

"भावार्थ

जैसे मनुष्यों से बिजली से सिद्ध की हुई तार विद्या से चाहे हुए काम सिद्ध किए जाते हैं वैसे ही सन्यासी के संग से समस्त विद्याओं को पाकर धर्म आदि काम करने को समर्थ होते हैं। इन्हीं दोनों से व्यवहार और परमार्थ सिद्धि करी जा सकती है। इस से यत्न के साथ तड़ित्-तार-विद्या अवश्य सिद्ध करनी चाहिए।"

(ऋग्वेद भाष्य स्वामी दयानन्द, १९०४ संस्करण, पृष्ठ २११६)

Bhāvārtha

Jaise manushyōn se bijlī se siddh kī huyī tārvidyā se chāhe huye kām siddh kiye jāte hain, vaise hī sanyāsī ke sang se samast vidyāōn kō pākar dharma ādi kām karne kō samarth hōte hain. Inhīn dōnōn se vyavahār aur paramārtha siddhi karī jā saktī hai. Is se yatna ke sāth taḍit-tār-vidya avaśya siddh karnī chāhiye.

(Ṛig-Veda Bhāshya of Swami Dayanand, 1904 Edi., Page 2116)

Translation —

Just as man accomplishes the tasks he desires with the help of telegraphy which he has developed with the help of electric energy, in the same manner, people acquire all sciences and knowledge through association with *Sanyasis*[1] and become capable of carrying on all their worldly and religious duties etc. Thus with the help of these two, people can successfully achieve the fulfilment of their worldly and spiritual objects. Man should therefore make an effort to achieve mastery in the science of electricity and telegraphy. (Rig-Veda Bhā. of Swami Dayanand, 1904 Edi., P.2116)

If this is the knowledge that God possesses and this is the method for teaching sciences, the whole world would

1. Life in ancient India was divided into four periods, each of 25 years, Brahmacharya, Gṛihastha, Vānaprastha and Sanyāsa. One in the last period of life was known as a Sanyāsi.

rather cry out for being saved from such knowledge and such lessons !

47. Similarly, the *mantras* which have been put forward as giving a description of the knowledge of shipping and balloons are at best extremely confusing. Indians had hoped that important scientific principles or some secret of quick transport through the air or across the ocean would be obtainable from the *mantras* referred to but on the contrary, the translation of the *mantras* contains only a mention of ships and balloons and a few things ordinarily understood. For example, it is written in the Urdu Edition of the Rigvedadi Bhāshya Bhūmika, 1898 Edition, Page 123 :—

"جس شخص کو دولت حاصل کرنے کی خواهش هو (تگر) وہ
راحت و پرورش کے سامان یعنی دولت یا فتح کو حاصل کرنے کے لئے
علم طبیعات (پدارتھ ودیا) کے ذریعہ سے اپنی خواهش کو پورا
کرے - اُس کو چاهئے کہ زمین سے پیدا هونے والي لکڑي و لوهے
وغیرہ اشیاء سے جہاز بناکر آگ اور پانی کي طاقت سے سمندر میں
چلائے اور اُس کے ذریعہ سے مال و دولت پیدا کرے - اس طرح کرنے
سے انسان کو اس قدر مال و دولت حاصل هوتا هے کہ وہ کبھي
بھوکا نہیں مرتا کیونکہ محنت کا همیشہ نیک نتیجہ ملتا هے -
اس لئے دوسرے برے اعظموں میں جانے کے لئے همیشہ بڑی تدبیر
و محنت سے سمندر کے اوپر جہاز چلانے چاهئیں - جہاز رانی کے
لئے دو قسم کے سامان (اشون) کی ضرورت هے - ایک دیو یعنی
روشنی دینے والی چیزیں مثلاً آگ وغیرہ دوسرے پرتھوی مئے
یعنی زمین سے پیدا هونے والی چیزیں مثلاً لوھا - تانبا - چاندی
وغیرہ دھاتیں اور لکڑي وغیرہ اشیاء - ان دونوں سے جہاز وغیرہ
سواریاں بناکر دوسرے ملکوں میں آرام کے ساتھ آمدورفت کرنی
چاهئے - راج پرش (سرکاري حکام) اور ویوپاریوں (تاجروں) اور
نیز دیگر لوگوں کے آرام کے لئے جو بحری سفر کا ارادہ رکھتے
هوں بذریعہ جہاز سمندر میں آمدو رفت قائم کرنی چاهئے - نیز
سامان مذکورہ بالا سے اور بھی کئی قسم کی سواریاں مثل غبارہ

وغیرہ کے طیار کرنی چاھئیں انترکش (خلا بالائے زمین) میں
سفر کرنے والوں کو ومان (غبارہ) بنانا چاھئے اور اس طرح
ھر انسان کو بڑی حشمت اور دولت حاصل کرنی چاھئے - جہاز
پانی کے اثر سے بالکل محفوظ ھونے چاھئیں - یعنی اُن پر نہایت
چکنا روغن کرنا چاھئے تاکہ اُن کے اندر پانی نہ بھرجائے - اس طرح
زمین پر چلنے والی سواریوں کے ذریعہ سے خشکی پر اور پانی میں
چلنے والے جہازوں وغیرہ کے ذریعہ سے پانی میں اور انترکش میں
چلنے والی سواریوں کے ذریعہ سے ھوا کے اندر سفرکرنا چاھئے - گویا
ھر سہ قسم کے سفر کے لئے مذکورہ بالا تین قسم کی سواریاں بنانی
چاھئیں -" (رگ وید منڈل ۱ - سوکت ۱۱۶ - منتر ۳) -

"Jis śakhs kō daulat hāsil karne kī khvāhish hō (tugra) voh rāhat va parvarish ke sāmān yānī daulat yā fateh kō hāsil karne ke liye 'ilm-i-tabayyiyāt (padārtha-vidyā) ke zariye se apnī khvāhish kō pūrā kare. Uskō chāhiye ki zamīn se paidā hōne vālī lakṛī va lōhe vagairah aśiyā se jahāz banā kar āg aur pānī kī tāqat se samundar men chalāye aur uske zariye se māl va daulat paidā kare. Is tarah karne se insān kō is qadar māl va daulat hāsil hōta hai ki voh kabhī bhūkā nahīn martā kyōnki mehnat kā hameshā nek natījā miltā hai. Is liye dūsre barr-i-āzamōn men jāne ke liye hameshā baṛī tadbīr va mehnat se samundar ke ūpar jahāz chalāne chāhiyen. Jahāzrānī ke liye dō qism ke sāmān (aśvin) kī zarūrat hai—Ek divya yānī rōshnīn dene vālī chīzen, maslan āg vaghairah, dūsre pṛithvīmaya yānī zamīn se paidā hōne vālī chīzen maslan lōhā, tānbā, chāndī vaghairah, dhātuen aur lakṛī vaghairah aśiyā. In dōnō se jahāz vagairah savāriyān banā kar dūsre mulkōn men ārām ke sāth āmad-ō-raft karnī chāhiye. Rāja Purusha (Sarkārī hukkām) aur vyōpāriyōn (tājirōn) aur nīz dīgar lōgōn ke ārām ke liye, jō beharī safar kā irādā rakhte hōn, bazariye jahāz samundra men āmad-ō-raft qāyam karnī chāhiye. Nīz sāmān mazkūrā bālā se aur bhī kayee qism kī savāriyān misl gubbārāh vaghairah ke tayyār karne chāhyen. Antariksha (khalā bālāye zamīn) men safar karne vālōn kō vimān (gubbārāh) banānā chāhiye aur is tarah har insān kō baṛī hashmat aur daulat hāsil karnī chāhiye. Jahāz pānī ke asar se bilkul mahfūz hōne chāhiyen yānī un par nihāyat chiknā rōghan karnā chāhiye tāki unke andar pānī na bhar jāye. Is tarah zamīn par chalne vālī savāriyōn ke zariye se khushkī par aur pānī men chalne vāle jahāzōn vaghairah ke zariye se, pānī men

aur antariksha men chalne vālī savāriyōn ke zariye se, havā ke andar safar karnā chāhiye. Gōyā har seh qism ke safar ke liye mazkūrā bālā tīn qism kī savāriyān banānī chāhiyen."

(Rig-Veda Manḍala 1, Sūkta 116, Mantra 3).

Translation —

Whosoever has the desire to acquire wealth, should with the help of physical sciences fulfil his desire by achieving wealth and victory which provide comfort and means of maintenance. He should build ships with timber and iron etc. obtainable from the earth, and take them across the seas with the help of fire and water, and thus earn wealth and become prosperous. By doing so, man is able to earn so much wealth and property that he never starves because the result of hard work is always good. Therefore, in order to go to other continents one should always take ships over the seas with great pains and circumspection. Two kinds of things (*aśvini*) are necessary for shipping, viz, (1) luminous things, i.e. things which give light, e. g. fire etc., and (2) solids, i.e. things obtainable from the earth e.g. iron, copper, silver, etc. and other metals and timber etc. Transport between different countries should be facilitated by the use of ships made outof these two materials. Government officials, traders and other persons also who may desire to undertake sea-voyages should help to establish traffic on the seas by means of ships. Moreover, people should make from the materials referred to above other kinds of conveyances also e.g. balloons etc. Those who travel through the *Antarikṣha*,[1] i. e. through the void above the earth, should make balloons etc. and thus every person should acquire much wealth and prosperity. Ships should be protected fully from the ravages of water, i.e. they should be painted with very great care so that water may not enter inside the ships. Thus man

1. 'Antariksha' is said to be the region between the earth and the sun.

should travel on land by means of conveyances which move on land, on water by means of conveyances which move on water and in the atmosphere by means of conveyances which fly in the atmosphere. In short, man should make three kinds of conveyances for the three kinds of travel as referred to above.[2]
(Rig-Veda, Maṇḍala 1, Sūkta 116, Mantra 3)

48. Is it possible for any individual who gets information that ships are made out of timber and steel etc. and propelled in the sea with the energy obtained from fire and water or that those who want to fly through the atmosphere above the earth should make balloons, or that the ships should be completely protected from the bad effects of water, but who has not seen any real ship or balloon, to draw any inference for himself, or to have any conception of the principles governing the manufacture of ships and balloons ? If the *Vedas* are taken as historical books of the ancient times, the only thing that can at most be established from these meanings of the *mantras* is that the Aryans made use of ships and balloons in the past. This kind of incomplete knowledge and such imperfect hints and indications from God about oceanic and air travel appear to be merely a matter to be laughed at. Moreover, the greatest difficulty for Satsangis is that the original *mantras* give only a description of ordinary boats and there is no mention at all of their propulsion by the energy of fire and water.

49. Swami Dayanand, while describing the movements of the earth and the sun, has written in the Satyārtha Prakāśa as below :—

"जो लोग कहते हैं कि सूर्य घूमता है और पृथिवी नहीं घूमती वे

---

1. The original mantra of the Ṛig-Veda is :—

तुग्रो ह भुज्युमश्विनोदमेघे रयिं न कश्चिन् मम्रवाँ अवाहाः ।
तमू हथुर्नौभिरात्मन्वतीभिरन्तरिक्षप्रुद्भिरपोदकाभिः ॥

Tugrō ha bhujyumaśvinōdameghe rayim na kaśchin mamṛivān avāhāḥ,
Tamū haṭhurnaubhirātmanvatībhirantariksha prudbhirapōdakābhiḥ.

सब अज्ञ हैं, क्योंकि जो ऐसा होता तो कई सहस्र वर्ष के दिन और रात होते, अर्थात् सूर्य का नाम (ब्रध्नः) पृथिवी से लाख गुना बड़ा और क्रोड़ों कोश दूर है। जैसे राई के सामने पहाड़ घूमे तो बहुत देर लगती और राई के घूमने में बहुत समय नहीं लगता, वैसे ही पृथिवी के घूमने से यथायोग्य दिन रात होता है, सूर्य के घूमने से नहीं। और जो सूर्य को स्थिर कहते हैं वे भी ज्योतिर्विद्यावित् नहीं क्योंकि यदि सूर्य न घूमता होता तो एक राशि स्थान से दूसरी राशि स्थान को प्राप्त न होता।"

(सत्यार्थप्रकाश, तेरहवाँ हिन्दी संस्करण समु० ८, पृष्ठ २४१)

"Jō lōg kahte hain ki sūrya ghūmatā hai aur prithivī nahīn ghūmatī ve sab ajña hain, kyōnki jō aisā hōtā tō kayee sahasra varsha ke din aur rāt hōte, arthāt sūrya kā nām (bradhnaḥ) pṛithivī se lākh gunā baṛā aur kroṛōn kōś dūr hai. Jaise rāyee ke sāmne pahāṛ ghūme tō bahut der lagtī aur rāyī ke ghūmane men bahut samaya nahīn lagtā, vaise hī pṛithivī ke ghūmane se yathāyōgya din rāt hōtā hai, sūrya ke ghūmane se nahīn. Aur jō sūrya kō sthir kahte hain ve bhī jyōtirvidyā-vit nahīn kyōnki yadi sūrya na ghūmatā hōtā tō ek rāśi sthān se dūsre rāśi sthān kō prāpt na hōtā", ityādi

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, Samullās 8, Pṛishṭha, 241).

Translation —

Those who say that the sun revolves and the earth does not, are all ignorant of facts , for if such had been the case, the day and night must have been as long as a few thousand years each. The sun is called 'Bradhnah'; i.e. it is hundred thousand times bigger than the earth and ten millions of miles away. Just as, if a mountain moves round the sesame seed, it will take very long and if the sesame seed moves round the mountain, it will not take much time, similarly, it is on account of the revolution of the earth that days and nights of appropriate length take place and not because of the revolution of the sun. And those persons also who consider the sun to be stationary are ignorant of the science of Astronomy, for if the sun were not moving at all, it would not have moved from one zodiacal house to another, etc.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 13th Hindi Edi. Samullās 8, P. 241)

50. Of course, the statement of Swami Dayanand that the earth revolves is quite correct and perfectly scientific, but do day and night take place because the earth revolves round the sun ? And is it really the case that the sun moves from one zodiacal house to another or, on the other hand, do day and night take place because the earth rotates round its own axis and the sun appears to move from one zodiacal house to another because the earth revolves round the sun ?

51. Swami Dayanand has written a tract on 'Cow Protection' and it is named '*Go-karuna-nidhi*'. In this tract, the author has given expression in very forceful language to the harmful results of cow-slaughter, and has based his arguments on numerical calculations. Whatever he has stated regarding cow-protection deserves all respect, but the calculations that he has made show that he did not pay any attention to the rules for preparing estimates and finding out averages. He has written :—

"अगर एक गाय कम से कम दो सेर दूध देती हो और दूसरी बीस सेर तो फ़ी गाय के ११ सेर दूध देने में शुबहा नहीं है। इस हिसाब से एक महीने में सवा आठ मन दूध होता है। एक गाय कम से कम छः महीने और दूसरी ज़्यादा से ज़्यादा १८ महीने तक दूध देती है तो दोनों के दूध देने के अर्से की औसत फ़ी गाय बारह महीने होती है। इस हिसाब से बारह महीनों का दूध ९९ मन होता है। अगर इस दूध को पका कर फ़ी सेर छटाँक चावल और डेढ़ छटाँक चीनी डालकर खीर बनावें और फ़ी शख़्स दो सेर दूध की खीर दी जाय तो एक गाय के दूध से १९८० इन्सान एक वक़्त पेट भर सकते हैं। गाय कम से कम ८, ज़्यादा से ज़्यादा १८ मर्तबा बच्चे देती है। इसकी औसत १३ हुई तो २५७४० इन्सान एक गाय के १३ बेंत से पेट भर सकते हैं। इस गाय की एक पुश्त में ६ बछड़ियाँ और ७ बछड़े हुए। अगर उनमें से एक मर भी जाय तो भी १२ बचते हैं। इन ६ बछड़ियों के दूध से बहिसाब मुन्दर्जा बाला १,५४,४४० इन्सानों

का पेट भर सकता है। अब रहे ६ बैल, उनकी एक जोड़ी से अन्दाजन् दो सौ मन अनाज पैदा हो सकता है। इस तरह तीन जोड़ियाँ ६०० मन अनाज पैदा करेंगी। और वे आठ बरस तक काम करेंगी, गोया जिन्दगी भर में ४८०० मन अनाज पैदा करेंगी। अगर फ़ी इन्सान तीन पाव अनाज दिया जाय तो इस अनाज से २,५६,००० इन्सानों का एक बार भोजन हो जाता है और दूध और अनाज की मीज़ानों के देखने से क़रार पाता है कि ४,१०,४४० इन्सानों को एक मर्तबा खाना मुहय्या हो जाता है।" इत्यादि।

"Agar ek gāye kam se kam dō ser dūdh detī hō aur dūsrī bīs ser, tō fi gāye ke 11 ser dūdh dene men śubhā nahīn hai. Is hisāb se ek mahīne men savā āṭh man dūdh hōtā hai. Ek gāye kam se kam 6 mahīne aur dūsrī zyādā se zāydā 18 mahine tak dūdh detī hai, tō dōnōn ke dūdh dene ke arse kī ausat fi gāye bārah mahīne hōtī hai. Is hisāb se bārah mahīnōn kā dūdh 99 man hōtā hai. Agar is dūdh kō pakā kar fi ser chhatānk chāval aur deṛh chhatānk chīnī ḍāl kar khīr banāven aur fi śakhs dō ser dūdh kī khīr dī jāye tō ek gāye ke dūdh se 1980 insān ek vaqt peṭ bhar sakte hain. Gāye kam se kam 8, zyādā se zyādā 18 martabā bachhe detī hai. Iskī ausat 13 huyī, tō 25,740 insān ek gāye ke 13 bent se peṭ bhar sakte hain. Is gāye kī ek pushta men 6 bachhaṛiyān aur 7 bachhaṛe huye. Agar unmen se ek mar bhī jāye tō bhī 12 bachte hain. In 6 bachhaṛiyōn ke dūdh se bahisāb mundarjā bālā 1,54,440 insānōn kā peṭ bhar saktā hai. Ab rahe 6 bail, unkī ek jōṛī se andāzan dō sau man anāj paidā hō saktā hai. Is tarah tīn jōṛiyān 600 man anāj paidā karengī. Aur ve āṭh baras tak kām karengī, gōyā zindgī bhar men 4800 man anāj paidā karengī. Agar fi insān tīn pāv anāj diyā jāye, tō is anāj se 2,56,000 insānōn kā ek bār bhōjan hō jāta hai aur dūdh aur anāj kī mīzānōn ke dekhane se qarār pātā hai ki 4,10,440 insānōn kō ek martabā khānā muhayyā hō jātā hai", etc.

Translation —

If one cow gives at least two seers of milk and another 20 seers, there is no doubt that each cow gives 11 seers. According to this estimate, a cow's milk would amount to 8¼ maunds in a month. The lactation

period of one cow is at least 6 months and of another 18 months at the most. Thus the average period of lactation of the two cows is 12 months. Accordingly the quantity of milk given by one cow comes to 99 maunds during 12 months. If this milk is boiled and one chhatāk[1] of rice and 1½ chhatāks of sugar per seer is put into it and milk pudding is prepared and each individual is given the pudding prepared from two seers of milk, it would appear that 1980 persons can satisfy their appetite at one meal. A cow calves at least 8 times and at the most 18 times. The average would be 13 times. Thus 25,740 persons can satisfy their appetite once with the milk of a cow giving birth to 13 calves. This cow would produce 6 she-calves and 7 he-calves. Even if one of them dies, there would be at least 12 left. From the milk of these 6 cows, according to the calculations recorded above, 1,54,440 men can satisfy their appetite. Now 6 oxen are left. A pair of them can produce approximately 200 maunds of corn annually. Thus three pairs of them would produce 600 maunds and they will work for 8 years. In other words, the three pairs will produce 4,800 maunds of corn in their whole life-time. If 3/4 seer of cereals are supplied to one person, 2,56,000 men can be given one meal. And if we look at the total number of persons that can be provided with one meal prepared from milk and cereals, it comes up to 4,10,440 persons. etc.

On seeing these calculations, one is instinctively reminded of the following *Punjabi* proverb :—

'लेखा ज्यों का त्यों, कुनबा डूबा क्यों ?'

'Lekhā jyōn kā tyōn, kunbā ḍūbā kyōn ?'

Translation —

Admitted that calculations are all right, but why has the entire family perished ?

1. An Indian weight slightly heavier than 2 ounces.

If this calculation is correct, why should then there be dearth of milk and ghee in India, and why should dairies lament their lot all the twelve months round ? It is very much to be wished for that such cows, as Swami Dayanand had in view when he made his estimate, had really existed in India in sufficient numbers.

52. The arguments of Swami Dayanand with regard to return of the spirit from the state of salvation and his objections against everlasting salvation have already been described in paragraphs 55 to 65 of Part I of Yathārtha Prakāśa and it should not at all be necessary to repeat them here. Everybody feels amused to read the objections (i) that there would be overcrowding in the place where liberated spirits stay and (ii) that salvation means getting drowned in Brahma etc. Readers would recollect that Swami Dayanand referred to two *mantras* of the *Vedas* in support of his statement. In the last few days, I had occasion to hear the story about those two *mantras* of Rig-Veda from *Panchika*[1] 7, *Khanda*[2] 16 of Aitereya Brahmaṇa. This story throws considerable light on the subject matter discussed in paragraphs 58 and 59 of Part I of Yathārtha Prakāśa. Swami Dayanand has stated in Satyārtha Prakāśa that in the first *mantra*, the following question has been asked :—

هم لوگ کس کا نام پاک سمجھیں ؟ کون غیرفانی اشیاء کے
اندر موجود دیوتا همیشه موجود بالذات سب کو ظاهر کرنے
والا هے اور هم کو مکتی کا سکھ بھگوا کر پھر اس دنیا میں جنم
دیتا اور ماں باپ کا دیدار دکھاتا هے ؟
(ستیارتھ پرکاش چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن صفحه ۲۷۳)

"Ham lōg kis kā nām pāk samjhen ? Kaun ghairfānī aśiyā ke andar maujūd devatā hameśā maujūd bilzāt[3] sabkō zāhir karne vālā hai aur hamkō mukti kā sukh bhugvākar phir is duniyā men janam detā aur mān bāp kā dīdār dikhātā hai ?

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 273)

---

1. In Aitereya Brāhmaṇa, the name 'Pañchikā' has been given to Parts of the book, each having 5 chapters. 2. Section of a chapter. Each Chapter has Khaṇḍas. 3. The word is pronounced 'bizzāt'.

Translation —

Whose name should we regard as holy ? Who is that Ever-existent Deity Who abides among imperishable objects and Who, the Manifestor of everything that exists, after giving us an opportunity to enjoy the bliss of salvation, once again causes us to be reborn in the world and thereby gives us the privilege of seeing our father and mother."

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th. Urdu Edition, Page 273)

And the reply is given in the second *mantra*:—

ہم.....پرماتما کا نام پاک سمجھیں جو ہم کو مکتی میں آنند بھگوا کر پھر زمین میں ماں باپ کے تعلق سے جنم دلا کر ماں باپ کا دیدار دکھاتا ہے۔

(ستیارتھ پرکاش چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن صفحہ ۲۷۳)

"Ham Paramātmā kā nām pāk samjhen jō hamkō muktī men ānand bhugvākar phir zamīn men mān bāp ke ta'alluq se janm dilā kar mān bāp kā dīdār dikhātā hai."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th. Urdu Edition, Page 273)

Translation —

We should regard as holy the name of the Paramātmā[1], Who after giving us an opportunity to enjoy bliss of salvation causes us to be reborn on this earth to our parents and enables us to see them.

But as has already been explained, there is no mention whatsoever in these *mantras* of a return from the state of salvation and no such word has been used in these *mantras* as could be interpreted to mean "after giving us an opportunity to enjoy the bliss of salvation". The story of the Aitereya Brahmaṇa not only establishes the absolute correctness of our view but on the other hand, it also makes two other wonderful disclosures. It is therefore reproduced below: —

1. The word, 'Paramātmā is made up of two words परम (parama)—Supreme and आत्मन् (ātman)—spirit. Thus the word stands and is used for the Supreme Being.

'It is stated that a King, Harish Chandra by name, prayed to god Varuṇa[1] that he may have children and in this connection, promised that he would offer the first child to the god. Thus a son was born to him. The god reminded him of his promise again and again, but the King, on one pretext or the other, postponed taking action till the prince grew up into a young man. Then the King told the prince everything about the matter. The prince refused to be sacrificed, and ran away from home and hid himself in the forest. Meanwhile, the King fell a prey to 'dropsy', and imagined that this was the result of the anger of god Varuṇa. In the forest, the prince came into contact with *Rishi* Ajīgarta. This *Rishi* was in a very troubled condition on account of poverty. The prince induced him to sell his son for being sacrificed. The *Rishi* had three sons. Compelled by poverty, he sold his second son, Śunahśepa[2] by name, for a hundred rupees and all the three, i.e. the Prince, Śunahśepa and Śunahśepa's father came to the King. The King succeeded in persuading god *Varuna* to agree to accept the sacrifice of Śunahśepa in place of the prince and preparations for the *Yajna* were started. These were completed and Viśvāmitra, Jamdagni and other *Rishis* began the sacrifice. But nobody dared to tie Śunahśepa to the sacrificial post[3]. Ajigarta said that if he was paid another sum of hundred rupees, he would do this as well. The amount was paid to him and he tied Śunahśepa to the post. Then the question arose as to who would slaughter him. For this work as well, one hundred rupees more were paid and Ajigarta undertook to do the needful. When Ajigarta drew out the sword and advanced to sacrifice his son Śunahśepa, the son felt stunned and prayed to Prajapati :

1. One of the Vedic deities. God of Sea or God of water in later Ṛig-Vedic period. 2. Readers will be amused to know that the meaning of the word 'Śunaḥśepa' is 'Dog's tail'. 3. The word is Yūpa (यूप). The victim to be sacrificed had first to be tied to the sacrificial post according to the prescribed procedure.

'O Prajapati, be pleased to tell me which god's holy name out of all gods, should we keep in our mind, so that it may lead us back once again to great Aditi in order that we may be enabled to have the '*Darśana*' of the father and the mother.[1]"

Prajapati replied that he should repeat the name of god *Agni*. On this Śunahśepa praised God *Agni* and said :—

The name of god *Agni*, who is First and Foremost among all the gods should be kept in mind. He would lead us back again to Aditi so that we may be enabled to see the father and the mother.[2]

The life of Śunahśepa was saved at last by acting on the instructions of *Rishi* Viśvāmitra and god Varuṇa was pacified and the King also was cured of his dropsy.

Now if the Aitereya Brāhmaṇa[3] commands any respect in the Hindu world, it would be established that the statements which are presented as *Śruti* or Vedic texts to establish

---

1. This prayer of Śunaḥśepa is the 1st mantra of Sūkta 24 of Rig-Veda Manḍala 1. Also refer to para 59 of Part I of Yathārtha Prakāśa. The text is :—

कस्य नूनं कतमस्यामृतानां मनामहे चारु देवस्य नाम ।
को नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात् पितरम् च दृशेयं मातरम् च ॥

Kasya nūnam katamasyāmṛitānām manâmahe chāru devasya nām,
Kō nō mahyā Aditaye punardât pitaram cha driśeyam mātaram cha.

2. This is Mantra 2 of Sūkta 24 of Ṛig-Veda Manḍala 1. And these same two mantras have been quoted by Swami Dayanand in Satyārtha Prakāśa as authority for return from Mukti. The original text in Sanskrit is :—

अग्नेर्वयं प्रथमस्यामृतानां मनामहे चारु देवस्य नाम ।
स नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात् पितरं च दृशेयं मातरम् च ॥

Agnervayam prathamasyāmṛitānām manāmahe chāru devasya nām,
Sa nō mahyā Aditaye punardāt pitaram cha dṛiśeyam mātaram cha.

3. Swami Dayanand himself has quoted authority of this Brāhmaṇa in his writings, e.g. refer to pages 31 and 144 of the Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, First Urdu Edition, 1898.

the theory of 'return from the state of salvation' were really the prayers of Śunaheśepa when he found himself in distress. It is simply absurd that such statements should be taken as the word of God and Satsangis compelled to accept them as authoritative.

It appears necessary also to add here that the name Śunahśepa also occurs in *mantras* 12 and 13 of this very *Sukta*, and though the Arya Samajists, in order to escape the blame of finding history in the *Vedas*, have taken the literal meaning of the word Śunahśepa and have thus tried to avoid the issue, yet this attempt of theirs is of no avail, for in the *Vedas* published by them the following words appear in the beginning of the *Sukta* itself :—

'आजीगर्त्तिः शुनः शेपः कृत्रिमो वैश्वामित्रो देवराति ऋषि',

'Ājīgartiḥ Śunaḥśepaḥ kṛitrimō Vaiśvāmitrō devarāti Ṛishi',

Translation—

The *Rishi* of this *Sukta* is Śunahśepa, God-given[2], son of Ajīgarta and the adopted son of Viśvāmitra.

Thus the meaning of the word Śunahśepa used in *mantras* 12 and 13 should be only Rishi Śunahśepa and nothing else. Any way, this story is written in the Aitereya Brāhmaṇa and at the end of the story, it is stated that Śunahśepa, when he escaped being sacrificed, received his education under the guidance of *Rishi* Viśvāmitra and himself became a great *Rishi*.

53. The origin of creation has been described in *Samullas* 8 of the Satyārtha Prakāśa and on page 234 of the 13th Hindi Edition, the following question has been raised :—

प्रश्न—आदि सृष्टि में मनुष्य आदि की बाल्य, युवा वा वृद्धावस्था में सृष्टि हुई थी, अथवा तीनों में ?

---

1. After his release and acceptance by Visvāmitra in his family, Śunahśepa became known as 'Davarāta' i. e. 'God-given'.

Praśna—"Ādi sṛishṭi men manushya ādi kī bālya, yuvā vā vṛiddhāvasthā men sṛishṭi huyee thī, athavā tīnōn men ?"

Translation —

Question—Were men and others created in the beginning of creation as babes or youths or as old persons or as all the three ?

उत्तर—युवावस्था में क्योंकि जो बालक उत्पन्न करता तो उनके पालन के लिये दूसरे मनुष्य आवश्यक होते और जो वृद्धावस्था में बनाता तो मैथुनी सृष्टि न होती। इसलिये युवावस्था में सृष्टि हुई है।

Uttar—"Yuvāvasthā men, kyōnki jō bālak utpann kartā tō unke pāḷan ke liye dūsre . manushya āvaśyak hōte aur jō vṛiddhāvasthā men banātā tō maithunī sṛishṭi na hōtī. Is liye yuvāvasthā men sṛishṭi huyee hai."

Translation —

Answer—As young people, or if they had been created as children, other grown-up persons would also have been necessary to bring them up and if they had been created as old men, there could have been no sexual intercourse and no further births. Therefore God created men as young people.

Obviously, this argument also is very weak. If all men were born young, God must have kept trees laden with fruits or fields full of crops ready to provide them food and in order that they may not have any difficulty in building houses or in kindling fire, God must have also kept many dried trees ready cut, and must have sawn and collected them. If this had not been done, the row that people must have created for food and shelter in the very beginning of the creation can very well be imagined. And it is really very sad to know that when youngmen could be created all at once, why did God change that method of creation and in its place substitute the process of creation by sexual intercourse and thus unnecessarily created difficulties and troubles for millions of males and females.

54. Swami Dayanand went to Udaipur in September, 1882. There he had a discussion with Maulvi Abdul Rehman which was recorded by three persons[1].

Maulvi Sahib asked, "Which is that religion, the original book of which may be considered as setting the standard for all natural ways of men and as source of all spoken languages ?"

Swami ji replied, "There is no book among religious books which could be relied upon in this matter because they are all full of partiality and prejudice. In my opinion, only that book which is free from partiality and prejudice can be said to be such a reliable book.........As far as I have investigated the matter so far, there is no other book excepting the *Vedas*, which could be relied upon by all, etc."

Maulvi ji—"Are not the *Vedas* religious books ?"

Swami ji—"The *Vedas* are not religious books. They are books of knowledge."

Maulvi ji—"What meaning do you give to the word 'religion' ?"

Swami ji—'Religion' is that in which there is partiality and prejudice, etc."

Is it permissible for us to infer from this conversation that the Vedic Dharma is not a Religion and the Ārya Samāj is not a religious society and also that all the religious societies which exist is the world today or will come into being in future, are and would be inspired by partiality and prejudice ?

55. When Swami Dayanand was staying at Hardwar in March 1879, Pt. Iswar Singh, a *Nirmala Sadhu*[2] met him and conversation ensued. The *Sadhu* said, "Kindly let

1. Vide Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand by Mahāśaya Lakshmaṇa, page 859. 'Nirmala Sādhus' belong to a sect of the Sikh religion.

me see the four *Vedas*." Swamiji brought them from inside the room and the *Sadhu* was very much pleased to see them. The Swamiji pointed out mistakes in the commentaries of Mahidhar and Sāyaṇa and said "These rogues[1] have given very incorrect meanings." The *Sadhu* said, "Formerly you admitted that the spirit of man and God are essentially the same." Swamiji replied, "I had not read till then all the *Vedas*[2]. When I read all the *Vedas* carefully and thought over the matter, I became convinced that it was against *Vedic Dharma*[3] to believe that the *Jiva* and *Brahma* are essentially the same." Iswar Singh said: "As far as oneness of *Jiva* and *Brahma* is concerned, there is the authority of Shri Śankarāchārya. What authority have you in support of your view ?

Swamiji replied, "*Veda-Purusha*, i.e. *Paramatma* Himself".

Sadhuji said, "What reply have you to give regarding some *mantras* of the *Vedas* which accept the position of oneness of *Jiva* and *Brahma* ?"

Swamiji replied, "Both are correct" and gave the example that just as his hut was not separate from the *Akaśa*, the theory of oneness was correct and as his hut could not be *Akaśa*, the theory of *Jiva* and *Brahma* being separate was correct.

(Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand by Mahāśaya Lakshmaṇa, Pages 627 and 628).

56. At least this sort of belief cannot be said to be a 'perfect belief' when merely on the authority of the *Vedas* being mentioned, Swami Dayanand at once admitted that the oneness of the *Jiva* and *Brahma* is in accordance with the *Vedas*. The

---

1. Was Śāyaṇāchārya really a rogue ? 2. i. e. all the four Vedas.
3. This shows that Swami Dayanand had not had any experience through Yoga practices regarding the oneness of Jiva and Brahma and his belief was based merely on the book knowledge of the Vedas i.e. on the interpretation he himself had given to the mantras of the Vedas.

subject matter of the oneness of the *Jiva* and *Brahma* has been dealt with in the Satyārtha Prakāśa as well and whatever is written there is all the more astonishing. It is stated there:—

अब इसमें विचारना चाहिये कि जो जीव-ब्रह्म की एकता, जगत मिथ्या, शंकराचार्य का निज मत था तो वह अच्छा मत नहीं और जो जैनियों के खंडन के लिए उस मत का स्वीकार किया हो तो कुछ अच्छा है।

(सत्यार्थप्रकाश, तेरहवाँ हिन्दी संस्करण, पृष्ठ ३०४)

"Ab ismen vichāranā chāhiye ki jō Jīva-Brahma kī ektā, jagat mithyā, Śankarāchārya kā nij mat thā, tō voh achhā mat nahīn aur jō *Jainiyon ke khandan ke liye us mat ka svikar kiya ho to kuchh achchha hai.*"

('Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, page 304).

Translation —

Now it should be considered whether the view, viz, that the *Jiva* and *Brahma* are one and the creation is false, which was Śankarāchārya's basic belief, is correct. But if this view was accepted by Śankarāchārya only in order to criticize the Jains, then the view can be said to be somewhat acceptable.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, page 304)

Does Swamiji really permit that in order to criticize others, people could accept whatever theory they liked ?

57. Swamiji delivered a lecture at Amritsar in May 1878, and during the course of his lecture, he said :—

لوگ کہتے ہیں کہ انگریز دولت مند ہوتے جاتے ہیں اور
دیسی غریب - اس امر کا فکر نہ کرنا چاہئے کیونکہ جس قدر
انگریز دولت مند ہونگے اسی قدر آرام طلب ہونگے اور آرام طلبی
سے سست اور سستی سے کمزور ہو جاینگے اور دیسی لوگ غریب
ہونے کی وجہ سے محنت کش ہونگے اور محنت کش ہونے سے

طاقتور ھونگے - اس سے دیسی لوگ فائدہ میں رھینگے -
[(مہاشیہ لچھمن - مکمل جیون چرتر - صفحہ ٥٠٠]

"Lōg kahte hain ki Angrez daulatmand hōte jāte hain aur desī gharīb. Is amar kā fikr na karnā chāhiye, kyōnki jis qadar Angrez daulatmand hōnge usī qadar ārāmtalab hōnge aur ārām-talbī se sust aur sustī se kamzōr hō jāyenge. Aur desī lōg gharīb hōne kī vajah se mehnat-kash hōnge aur mehnat-kash hōne se tāqatvar hōnge. Is se desī lōg fāede men rahenge."
(Mahāśaya Lakshamaṇa : Mukammal Jīvan Charitra, Page. 500)

Translation —

People say that the English people are becoming richer everyday and the Indians poorer. One need not be worried about this matter, for the richer the Englishmen grow, the more ease-loving would they become and from their ease-loving nature would develop laziness and from laziness, weakness; while Indians on account of their poverty would be hard-workers and on account of hard work, they would be strong. Thus the Indians would be in an advantage.
(Complete Biography by Mahāśaya Lakshmaṇa, Page 500)

On this one Extra Asstt. Commissioner sent word to Swamiji that he should not have spoken like this before the public. Swamiji replied that he was not at all afraid of giving expression to what is true.

Fifty-six years have passed[1] since this lecture was delivered and the strength of the English people is on the increase while the Indians are as weak as before.

58. When Swami Dayanand was in Lahore, a gentleman came to him and stated, 'It is not understood how people keep awake throughout the night when there is a dance and music and other shows by prostitutes and they do not feel sleepy, but if there is any religious talk, people begin to feel sleepy just after a few minutes.' Swamiji replied,

1. The book was written in 1934 and till then 56 years had passed.

'Religious talk is like soft velvet bedding. If one does not get sleep on such a bedding, where else could he get it? Dancing etc. by prostitutes is however like a ground full of thorns where obviously it is impossible to get sleep.

(Page 510 of Complete Biography by Mahāśaya Lakshmaṇa)

If this argument be correct, obviously all persons who listen to religious talk must always be dreaming and the Arya Samajists must be sleeping soundly in their weekly meetings from the commencement of the meeting right up to the end. Possibly, Swami ji thought that as people feel sleepy during religious talk and also on velvety bedding, it was correct to infer that religious talk was like velvety bedding and considering that people do not get sleep during a dance etc., and they cannot sleep on thorns, he inferred that a dance is like a bed of thorns. Otherwise, if people really considered religious talk as velvety bedding, the whole world would have rushed to listen to religious talks and if dances and other such entertainments were as troublesome as thorns, nobody would have even by mistake joined any assembly for dancing etc.

59. Swami Dayanand was opposed to belief in ghosts, etc. It is stated in the Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand that a *Vaidya* of Budaun brought with him a young man and stated :—

'اس کو آسیب کا خلل ھے - بہت علاج کئے آرام نہیں ھوتا' -
سوامي جی نے فرمایا کہ 'تم پنڈت اور ویدیہ ھوکر ایسے اگیانی ھو
رھے ھو - اور ایسی استیہ (جھوٹھ) بات کو مانتے ھو - شوک ھے
تمہاری بدھی اور ودیا پر - ارے بھائیو !......بھوت یونی کوئی
نہیں ھے - اور جو لوگوں کو تکلیف ھوا کرتي ھے وہ کسي روگ
کی وجہ سے ھوتي ھے - ایسے کئی روگوں کا ویدک گرنتھوں میں
ذکر ھے - وغیرہ وغیرہ - (مکمل جیون چرتر صفحہ ۶۷۴)

'Iskō āseb kā khalal hai. Bahut ilāj kiye, ārām nahīn hōtā.' Swami ji ne farmāyā ki 'tum Paṇḍit aur Vaidya hōkar

aise agyānī hō rahe hō aur aisī (jhūṭh) bāt kō mānte hō. Śōk hai tumhārī buddhi aur vidyā par ! Are bhāiyō,...bhūt yōnī kōyee nahīn hai aur jō lōgōn kō taklīf huā kartī hai voh kīsī rōg kī vajah se hōtī hai. Aise kayee rōgōn kā vaidic granthōn men zikar hai, ityādi. (Complete Biography, page 674)

Translation —

'This youngman is mentally deranged under the influence of some ghost and though treatment of many kinds has been resorted to, yet the boy could not be cured.' Swami Dayanand replied, "You are a *Pandit* and a *Vaidya*[1] and even then you behave like an ignorant person and believe in a thing which is false. I simply feel disappointed to see your intelligence and learning ! O good people,...there is nothing like ghosts and if anybody experiences trouble some times, it is due to some disease. There is a mention of many such diseases in books of Āyurveda[2]."

(Complete Biography, page 674)

No doubt, this reply of Swami Dayanand is in accordance with the new ideas but is opposed to the views expressed in the *Śastras*. For example, just refer to Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (Chapter 3, Brāhmaṇa 3), where it is stated that a Brahman, Bhujyu by name, said to sage Yājñavalkya :—

'हे याज्ञवल्क्य ! हम मद्रदेशों में विद्यार्थी के तौर पर इधर उधर फिर रहे थे, सो हम पतञ्चल काप्य (कपि गोत्र के) घरों में पहुँचे। उसकी एक कन्या गन्धर्व के वशीभूत थी। हमने उसको पूछा 'तू कौन है'। उसने (गन्धर्व ने) उत्तर दिया 'मैं सुधन्वा आङ्गिरस (गोत्र का) हूँ'।

(पं० राजाराम : बृहदारण्यक उपनिषद् १६०५ संस्करण, पृ० १७१)

"He Yājñavalkya ! ham Madra deśōn men vidyārthī ke taur

---

1. A physician who treats diseases according to the Āyurvedic system of medicine is known and addressed as 'Vaidya'. 2. Ancient system of Indian medicine.

par idhar udhar phir rahe the. Sō ham Patañchal Kāpya (Kapi gōtra ke) gharōn men pahunche. Uskī ek kanyā Gandharva ke vaśībhūt thī. Hamne uskō pūchhā—'tū kaun hai ?' Usne (Gandharva ne) uttar diyā— 'Main Sudhanvā Āngiras (gōtra kā) hūn', ityādi."
(Pt. Raja Ram, Brihad. Upa. (1905 Edi.) Chap. 3, Brāh. 3, Page 171)

Translation —

O Yājṇavalkya! we were roaming about as students in the land of the Madra[1] people. Then we reached the home of Pātanchal Kāpya. One of his daughters was under the influence of a Gandharva[2]. I asked him, "who are you" and the Gandharva replied, "I am Sudhanvā, son of Angiras[3]," etc.
(Brihad. Upa. 1905 Edi. Chap. 3, Brāh. 3, Page 171)

In Brahmaṇa 7 of this same Chapter, another Brāhman Uddālaka Āruṇi by name, has described the same event as having been personally seen by him and in Chapter 6, Brāhmaṇa 4 of this very Upanishad, while describing how good children could be produced, instructions have been given that the man who desires to have children should, after washing his hands, fill a vessel with water and sprinkle that water on his wife three times and read the following *mantra* :—

1. Country between Ravi and Jhelum inhabited by the Madra people. 2. In the Rig-Veda, Gandharva is mentioned only as one god who guards the heavenly 'Sōma'. He is said to possess ladies and to have a peculiar mystical power over them. Later on there is mention of Gandharvas as a class of beings or gods inhabiting the region between the earth and the sun. 3. The original Sanskrit text is:—

मद्रेषु चरकाः पर्यव्रजाम, ते पतञ्चलस्य काप्यस्य गृहानैम, तस्यासीद् दुहिता गन्धर्वगृहीता,
तमपृच्छाम, 'कोसि' इति । सोऽब्रवीत्, 'सुधन्वाऽऽङ्गिरसः' इति । (३—३—१)

Madreshu charakāh paryavrajāma, te Patañchalasya Kāpyasya gṛihānaim, tasyāsīd duhitā Gandharvagṛiḥītā, tamapṛichhāma, 'Kōsi' iti. Sō abravīt, 'Sudhanvā Āngirasaḥ' iti. (3—3—1)

"O Viśvāvasu[1] Gandharva, you leave this my wife and go away to seek some other young woman who may be enjoying with her husband."[2]

60. If the statements of the Upanishad are considered insufficient, statements contained in Sacred *Vedas* may be perused. In Atharva-Veda (*Kanda* 11, *Sukta* 9), prayer has been offered to goddess Arbudi:

कुत्तों वाली अप्सराएँ, गीदड़ियाँ, पात्र के मध्य में बार बार चाटती हुई, रिशा बुरी तरह रक्खी वस्तु को चाहती हुई, इन सबको शत्रुओं को दृष्टिगोचर कर, हे अर्बुदे और (इनको) उदार (वेताल) दिखला। (मंत्र १५)

खड़ूर के ऊपर फिरती हुई को, बौनी को, बौने (कपड़े) पहने हुई को, जो उदार छिपे हुए हैं, जो गन्धर्व और अप्सराएँ हैं, सर्प, इतरजन और राक्षस हैं (उनको दिखला)। (मंत्र १६)

चार दाढ़ों वाले, काले दाँतों वाले, घड़े के मुष्कों वाले, लहू लगे मुखों वाले, स्वतःसिद्ध भयावने और भय देने वाले, (वेताल हमारे शत्रुओं को दिखला)। (मंत्र १७)

"Kutton-vālī apsarāyen, gīdaṛiyān, pātra ke madhya men bār bār chāṭatī huyī, rishā burī tarah rakkhī huyī vastu kō chāhtī huyī, in sab kō śatruōn ke dṛishṭigōchar kar, he Arbude, aur (inkō)udār (vetāla) dikhlā". (Mantra 15).

"Khaḍūr ke ūpar phirtī huyī kō, bauni kō, baune (kapṛe) pahne huyī kō, jō udār chhipe huye hain, jō Gandharva aur apsarāyen hain, sarp, itarjan aur rākshasa hain (unkō dikhlā)." (Mantra 16).

"Chār dāṛhōn vāle, kāle dāntōn vāle, ghaṛe ke mushkōn vāle, svatah siddha bhayāvane aur bhaya dene vāle, vetāla hamāre śatruōn ko dikhlā." (Mantra 17).

(Atharva-Veda Bhāshya by Pt. Raja Ram, Page 633).

---

1. 'Viśvāvasu' was the name of the Gandharva.
2. The original Sanskrit text is :—

'उत्तिष्ठाऽ तो विश्वावसो ऽन्यामिच्छ प्रपूर्व्याम् सं जायां पत्या सह' इति (६—४—१९)

'Uttishṭhā tō Viśvāvāsō anyāmichchha prapūrvyām sam jāyām patyā saha' iti. (6, 4, 19)

Translation—

'O Arbudi[1], the *Apsaras*[2] who have dogs, she-jackals, *Riśas*[3] licking pots again and again and wishing for things improperly placed, show all these to the enemies and also show them the demon *Vetala.*" (*Mantra* 15).

"The female dwarf and the male dwarf with clothes on and roaming over the sky and the *Vetalas* who are in hiding, the *Gandharvas*, the *Apsaras*, snakes and other such evil things and *Rakshasas*[4] may also be shown to the enemies." (*Mantra* 16).

"Those who have four jaws, those who have black teeth, those who have pitcher-sized scrotum, those whose mouths are smeared with blood, dreadful in appearance and given to terrorizing others, may also be shown to our enemies". (*Mantra* 17).

When one hears about ghosts, evil spirits, goblins, *Gandharvas*, etc. and thinks about the terrible appearance of their jaws, teeth and scrotum, one would wish that such categories of life did not exist. But when anyone accepts all the books written by sages from *Brahma* down to Jaimini as authoritative, he is left with no choice to use his intelligence nor has he any justificatoin to reject the existence of these categories of life.

61. In short, one comes across many such things in the books written by Swami Dayanand and in his Biography on a perusal of which, the seeker after truth gets bewildered and is not left with much regard for the knowledge and research of Swami Dayanand.

---

1. A serpent-like demon mentioned in the Vedas. 2. Female divinities, sometimes called 'nymphs' and also believed to be wives of Gandharvas. 3. 'Riśā' is a small animal. 4. A class of demons.

V

SWAMI DAYANAND AND YOGA-SĀDHANA

62. Now the question whether Swami Dayanand was a perfect *Yogi* or not remains to be discussed. In this connection, we need not write very much. The Arya Samaj as a body accepts him as the *Guru* and it is but usual for everyone to praise his *Guru*. It is therefore no wonder if the Arya Samajists call him a perfect *Yogi* and praise him, but if one studies his Biography or his own books without prejudice or partiality, it will be established that he possessed only as much competence in the knowledge of *Yoga* as Satsangis are generally believed to possess in the knowledge of the *Śastras*.

Question—Can you prove that he was not a perfect *Yogi* ?

Answer—It is not necessary for us to so prove it. The Arya Samaj itself has already proved this through the Biography of Swami Dayanand published by them and the books of Swami Dayanand himself also prove the same. It would be proper if you yourself studied the Biography and drew your own conclusions therefrom but if it is your wish that we should study the question together, there is no objection and we shall now refer to his Biography.

63. In 1849, when Swami Dayanand learnt that a *Sanyasi*, Yoganand by name, lived in Vyāsa Ashrama and that he had made much progress in *Yoga* practice, he immediately went to the *Sanyasi* and began to study *Yoga* under him and after studying all the elementary books on the subject, he started the practice. But in the meantime, he also heard that there was a South Indian Brahman, Krishna Śāstri by name, near Chittor and he was well-versed in Sanskrit Grammar. Swami Dayanand therefore went there and began to study grammar under Krishna Śāstrī and

subsequently he returned to Chāno Daknyālī and began to study the *Vedas* under the *Rajguru*. After some time, he came into contact with two *Yogis*, Jwālānand Puri and Śivānand Giri and he often discussed matters regarding *Yoga* with them and in their company engaged also in the practice of *Yoga*. Some days after this, the two *Yogis* left for Ahmedabad, and when leaving, they asked Swami Dayanand to reach Ahmedabad after a month where they would be staying by the side of a particular temple. They promised that at that place they would teach Swami Dayanand all the intricacies[1] and the methods of *Yoga*. Swami Dayanand went to Ahmedabad as they had advised and they fulfilled their promise and Swamiji says, "Those great *Yogis* satisfied me in every way by explaining to me the most important details and intricacies[2] of the *Yoga* practice. The entire knowledge of *Yoga* and the methods of its practice became clear to me as broad day-light. Really these *Yogis* did a very great favour to me and I am extremely grateful to them."

64. After a few days, he got the information that some *Yogis* of a very high status were living on the top of the Abu mountains. He started in search[3] of them and met the great *Yogis* on the peak named Arbudābhavānīgiri and found these *Yogis* even better and more learned[4] than the two former *Yogis*. In short, upto the year 1854, Swami Dayanand went to different places in this way and met great *Mahatmas* and continued to make spiritual progress. In 1855 when he was full 30 years old, he learnt that big *Yogis* and ascetics visit Hardwar for the *Kumbha* Fair and so he went there. So long as there was a crowd on account of the fair, Swami Dayanand stayed in the forests of Chandi

---

1. These words should be kept in mind. 2. These words should also be remembered. 3. It is not understood why he felt the need to search for people who could teach Yoga when he had already learnt all the intricacies and also when he had been satisfied in every way. 4. Even more learned than the Yogis he had met at Ahmedabad !

mountains and performed his *Yoga* practices. When the fair came to a close, he came down to Rishikesh and there in the company of the great *Mahatmas*, *Sanyasis* and *Yogis*, he continued his practice of *Yoga* and also derived benefit from their knowledge. After some time, he started on journey to inaccessible parts of the Himalayas and passing through Kedarghat and Rudra Prayag, he reached the *Samadhi* of *Sage* Agastya. From there he went to see the Shivpuri mountains and after staying there for four months, he started for Gupta Kashi and again returned to Kedarghat via Gaurikund, Bhīmaguphā and Triyugīnārāyan temple.

After some time he wished to visit the snow-covered peaks of Himalayas in the neighbourhood and to search for those *Mahatmas* about whom so many different kinds of things are generally heard. He thus visited those mountains; but it was ultimately established that the reports generally current about these places were mostly false. While thus going about, he ascended the peak of Tungnāth and found the temple there full of idols and priests. He felt disgusted and returned from there and after some time reached Okhimath. The Chief *Mahant* of this Math induced Swami Dayanand to become his disciple and thereby become the owner of property worth lacs of rupees, but Swami Dayanand replied with extreme indifference and contempt that if he had any desire for wealth, he had enough of it at his own home. He said, "I find no trace of the thing in search of which I had left my home, nor do any of you at all seem anxious for it. How could I then stay here for long?" The *Mahant* asked, "What is it that you are searching for?" Swamiji replied in all seriousness, "It is true knowledge, *Yoga* and salvation.[1] As long as my heart's desire is not fulfilled, I shall keep myself engaged in doing

1. No doubt, at this time his condition was like that of a true seeker.

good to my countrymen and this is also the duty of every individual."

65. After leaving Okhimath, Swami Dayanand went to Joshi Math and then reached Badri Narayan. One day, he asked the *Raval*[1] of the Math, "Is there no competent *Yogi* near about here?" The *Raval* replied with great regret that there was no such person in that area at that time[2]. After staying for some time at Badri Narayan, he again started in search of *Yogis* and reached the banks of the Alakhnanda river and began to cross the river barefooted. The river was very deep in some places and in others was full of sharp pieces of snow, so that his feet got wounded[3] and blood began to flow from them and a sort of unconsciousness came over him. Due to severe cold, he felt completely frozen. At last, he put off all his clothes and covered his feet upto the knee, but he had neither the courage nor the strength to make a move from there. Then two hillmen happened to come. Swami Dayanand told them all that had happened to him. They undertook to take him to the holy place of Siddhpat which was quite near the place, but for some reason or other, Swami Dayanand did not accept their hospitality. Those hillmen went away and after some time Swami Dayanand began to walk slowly step by step and returned to Badri Narayan in the evening. After staying there for some days, he started for Rampur and the same evening reached the cave of a *Yogi*, who was

---

1. Chieftain. As some maṭhs (monasteries) and temples had considerable properties attached to them, the Chief Priest occasionally had a secular title also as in this case. 2. Obviously, Swami Dayanand had not been able to attain peace of mind so far nor had he come into contact with any True Yogi. 3. We would not like to enquire how the pieces of snow could wound his feet, for being lighter than water, they generally float over the surface of the water. The feet could be wounded only if there was something sharp at the bottom of the river, but pieces of snow being lighter cannot stay at the bottom of the river. Probably these were pieces of shale with sharp edges.

considered to be a *Rishi* of a very high order[1]. At Rampur Swami Dayanand stayed with Ramgiri who was a famous pious-hearted ascetic, but after a talk with him in private Swami Dayanand found out that he had very little knowledge of *Yoga* and the thing he was in search of was not available with him.

66. After taking leave of Ramgiri, Swami Dayanand reached Droṇasāgar and stayed there for the whole winter. Here at one time he felt inclined that he should enter the Himalayas and commit suicide, but at the same time he felt that the best thing would be to leave the body only when true knowledge had been attained.[2] From there, he came to Gaṛh Mukteshwar via Moradabad and Sambhal which is situated on the bank of the Ganges. At that time, in addition to religious books, he had with him Ṡivasamhita, Haṭhpradīpikā, Yogabīj, Kesharāṇī Sangīt and other such books. Some of these books contained a description of nerve centres etc., but it was in such great detail that it could not be fully understood. He therefore doubted its correctness. Gradually, he felt desirous of removing his doubts through personal practical experience but he did not get any suitable opportunity for this. One day when he was sitting by the bank of the Ganges, a dead body accidently came floating in front of him. He went down into the river and dragged the body out on the bank and there began to operate upon it[3] with a sharp knife as best as he could. He opened his books and placed them before himself. First of all, he took out the heart and saw it closely. Then he cut out the parts of the head and the neck and placed them in front of him. When the description given in the books did not tally with

---

1. If that Yogi had really been a Rishi of a very high order, there would have been no need for Swami Dayanand to search for any other Yogi thereafter. 2. It is thus clear that so far he had not attained true knowledge nor did he come across any real Yogi. 3. This method of searching for the internal chakras and the nerves through which the spirit current flows inside a body was really astonishing.

the real parts of the dead body, he tore all the books to pieces and threw them in the river along with the dead body. After this experience, he gradually came to the conclusion that with the exception of the *Vedas*, *Upanishads* and Patanjali's *Yoga Darśana* and *Samkhya Darśana*[1], all other books[2] which had been written on the science and on the knowledge of *Yoga* were absolutely false and incorrect.

67. After spending some time more on the banks of the Ganges and passing through Farrukhabad and other places, he reached Kanpur about the end of 1855 and moving from one place to another between Kanpur and Allahabad for 5 months, he ultimately reached Mirzapur. He stayed for a month at the temple of Aśvalji in Vindhyachal and after reaching Banaras about the middle of September 1856 he began to live in the Barnāwālī cave. Here he came into contact with many capable *Pandits*. But after staying there for 12 days only, he moved onwards to achieve the object in the quest of which he had started[3]. Swami Dayanand reached Chunar on 1st. October, 1856. Here he gave up taking rice as well and taking milk only, he spent the whole day and night in the study of *Yoga* as well as in its practice. Swami ji writes in his Autobiography :—

> दुर्भाग्यवश वहाँ मुझे एक बड़ा दोष लग गया, अर्थात् भाँग पीने का स्वभाव हो गया जो कई बार उसके प्रभाव से मैं सर्वथा बेहोश हो जाया करता था।

> "Durbhāgyavaśa vahān mujhe ek baṛā dōsh lag gayā, arthāt bhāng pīne kā svabhāva hō gayā, jō kayee bār uske prabhāv se main sarvathā behōsh hō jāyā kartā thā.

Translation —

Unfortunately here I contracted a very bad habit,

1. 'Sāmkhya Darśana' of Kapila Muni is one of the six systems of Indian philosophy. 2. Does this refer even to those books which Swami Dayanand had not read till then? 3. So far his desire had not been fulfilled.

i.e. I became addicted to taking *bhang* as a result of which I became completely intoxicated on various occasions[1].

68. On 26th March, 1857, he started to see the source of the river Narbada. There in the forests, he had to face many troubles. Once he had an encounter with a black-bear, but he remained quite unafraid. For three years, he moved along the banks of the Narbada and there had opportunity of associating with many *Mahatmas*. From here, he went to Mathura and met a *Dandi Sanyasi*[2] whose name was Swami Virajānand and who was 81 years of age and was blind but was very learned in Sanskrit grammar. He had faith in all the books written by *Rishis*, but he hated Bhāgwat and other Purāṇas. Here Swami Dayanand studied Sanskrit Grammar *de novo*. Everyday, he brought cool and clean water for his *Guru* from the main current of the Yamuna and rendered all kinds of service to the *Guru* wholeheartedly. Within three years, the *Guru* made him quite proficient in Sanskrit grammar. After this, he asked for *Guru's* permissiom to leave. The *Guru* asked for *Guru-dakshina*[2]. Swami Dayanand stated in all humility that he would carry out the orders of his *Guru* whatever they may be. The Guru said, "(1) Render service to the country; (2) re-establish the position of the true *Śastras*, (3) remove the ignorance in which idol-worship flourishes; and (4) spread the Religion of *Vedas* in the whole world."

69. In April 1863, he took leave of his *Guru* and reached Agra, and began to preach religion. He taught the system of *Yoga* to many good people in Agra and

---

1. Of course, without the help of a Guru there is always some trouble or the other. 2. Daṇḍi Sanyāsis are a class of ascetics who usually carry a stick (daṇḍa). 3. In India, it was customary for a student to offer presents to his Guru after completion of his studies. This present is known as 'dakshiṇā'. Some Gurus did not accept any wordly objects, but wanted the disciple to carry out some task which they assigned.

gave them practical demonstration of its practices. He treated his stomach troubles himself and also his blood whenever it tended to become impure. Once he had trouble on account of boils. He therefore stood in the river Yamuna and performed the *Neoli Karma*.[1] He used to say that he had learnt that method with great pains from a '*kanphatta*'[2] *Yogi* on the banks of the Narbada after staying with him for a considerable time. Rai Bahadur Sundar Lal of Agra was suffering from some brain ailment. Swami ji taught him '*Neti*[3], *dhoti*'[4] and *Neoli*[5] *Karma*' and as a result, his trouble was removed. However, when leaving Agra, he asked all his disciples to give up the *Yoga* practices and told them that as they were all familymen, they could not at all times get such food as they should take and there was danger from carelessness and incontinence and therefore, it was better for them to suspend the *Yoga Practice*, lest they may contract some disease in his absence due to some mistake in the performance of the *Yoga* practices.'

70. One day Swami Dayanand desired Pandit Sundar Lal to get him the four *Vedas* from somewhere. The Pandit after a long search got only a few leaves of the *Vedas* from the libraries of two famous Pandits of Agra. Swami Dayanand said that those few leaves would serve no purpose and if the *Vedas* were not available at Agra, he would go and bring them from somewhere else. As long as Swami Dayanand was in Agra, he used to remove his doubts by referring them to Swami Virajanand and in this connection,

---

1. An exercise to clean the stomach by taking in and passing out water through the rectum. 2. 'Kanphaṭṭā' Yogīs are called so because they pierce their ears to make big holes in them. 3. In 'Neti' they pass a thread through the throat. This is also a Haṭha Yōga practice. 4. It refers to a practice of Haṭha Yōga to cleanse the body. There is a lace about an inch wide and five yards long which is swallowed through the mouth and then after drinking water, it is brought out. This is said to cleanse the intestines. 5. Were these the Yoga practices which Swami Dayanand had learnt ?

he himself occasionally went to Mathura. On the First of the first half of *Kartik* 1921 (corresponding to 1865 A.D.), he arrived at Dholpur, and thereafter proceeding via Gwalior and Jaipur he reached Pushkar early in March. At every place on the way he had discussions with other persons. Influenced by his discourses at Pushkar, people broke their rosaries and their strings of beads and collected them in heaps. At Jaipur, he criticized the Religion of the *Vaishnavas*[1] and preached that *Śaivism*[2] was the true religion. Maharaja Ram Singh of Jaipur also then became a follower of *Śaivism*. "The result was that *Śaivism* spread to such an extent that I myself distributed thousands of '*rudraksha*'[3] rosaries with my own hands. The *Śaiva* religion was established so strongly there that '*rudraksha*' rosaries could be seen even round the necks of elephants and horses, etc."[4] After going from Pushkar to Ajmer, he criticized the *Śaiva* religion also. It appears that on reaching Ajmer, there was a change in his views. At Ajmer, he very vehemently criticized idol-worship and Shrimad Bhāgvat. From Ajmer, he went to Kishangarh and from Kishangarh to Jaipur and from there he reached Agra early in November, 1866. There were great activities in Agra during those days in connection with the *Darbar*. He wrote a small pamphlet criticizing Shrimad Bhāgvat and the *Vaishnava* religion and several thousands of copies of the same were printed. Some of these were distributed by him free at Agra and others he took with him. From Agra he went to Mathura and presented to Swami Virajanand

---

1. Vaishnavism is the peculiar faith of the devotees of Vishṇu or of the Incarnations of Vishṇu. Followers of Vaishnavism are generally strict vegetarians. 2. Devotees of Lord Śiva are known as Śaivites and their faith as Śaivism. These people do not mind taking meat etc. 3. A special bead used for rosaries in India, particulary by followers of Śaivism. 4. The words are of Swami Dayanand himself. Evidently, Swami Dayanand's views had not turned Arya Samajist till then.

two gold *mohurs*[1] and one muslin piece. He also showed him his small pamphlet, on seeing which he became very pleased and blessed Swami Dayanand and allowed him to proceed to Hardwar to propagate the Vedic Religion on the occasion of the *Kumbha Mela*[2]. He reached Hardwar early in March 1867. The extent of the degradation of India was borne in upon him at Hardwar. The false and treacherous activities of Brahmans and the harm done by people's ignorance of Vedic Religion deeply stirred him and he made a firm resolve that he would keep himself engaged in propagating the *Vedas* throughout his life. He delivered an inspiring lecture on Religion and at the end he distributed everything that he had with him, viz, books, utensils, silk clothes, shawls, woollen clothes and cash, and sent Pandit Dayaram with a copy of Mahā Bhāshya[3], Rs. 35/- in cash and a piece of muslin with instructions to present these things to Swami Virajanand on his behalf and kept only one piece of loin cloth (langot[4]) for himself. Freeing himself thus from all worldly encumbrances he proceeded thereafter along the bank of the Ganges and reached Landhore and then reached Miranpur via Śukratāl, Parikshitgarh and Garh Mukteshwar. At every place, there was considerable discussion. Thus by and by he reached Anupshahar. As a result of his teachings there was a great commotion among the followers of the *Puranic*[5] religion and a Brahman, unmindful of his own life, poisoned him. Swami Dayanand came to know of this in time and ejected the poison from his body by performing the *Neoli Karma*.

---

1. A gold coin of the Moghul times, frequently used for presents and in ornaments. 2. A religious congregation or fair of Hindus held on an auspicious date which occurs every 12th year when the Sun is in the Zodiacal house of Kumbha (Aquarius). People bathe in the Ganges on that occassion at Hardwar or Allahabad. 'Mela' means Fair'. 3. Sage Patanjali's commentary on Paṇini's grammar, Ashṭādhyāyī, is known as Mahā Bhāshya. 4. Hindi word 'Langōṭ' means loin cloth. In India, ascetics and Sadhus often went about in a loin cloth. 5. Hindu Religion based mainly on the Purāṇas.

71. On May 1, 1879, Swami Dayanand reached Meerut. "One day Swami Dayanand was sitting at the house of Mr. Chhedilal, an employee of the Commissariat Department. Mr. Scott, Madam Blavatsky and a few other members of the Theosophical Society were also present. During conversation, addressing Swami Dayanand reverently, Mr. Scott said that they had heard that Swami Śankarāchārya could remove his spirit from his body and make it enter into another's body, to which Swami Dayanand replied that he could also withdraw all his vital force from the entire body and collect it in one part of the body, so that the remaining body appears to be dead. He said it was long since he had given up the practice but even then he could show all that, if so desired. He also said that he preferred to help others[1] and to show them the right path to saving[2] himself through *Yoga* practice and this was why he left off his own *Yoga* practice[3]. But when a person of average practice like myself could collect all his vitality in a part of his body, then it was going only one step further to introduce one's spirit into another's body, which did not appear to be impossible. As far as the question whether Śankarāchārya did so or not, it is a matter of history and he had no personal knowledge in this connection.[4] It is absolutely clear that Swami Dayanand had given up his practice of *Yoga* since some time past, because he preferred doing good to others to attaining salvation for himself through *Yoga* practices. But this condition is not usually that of a perfect *Yogi*, but is of a person who becomes disappointed for some reason or other and gives up the practice of *Yoga*. In order to be a perfect *Yogi*, one must necessarily achieve the stage of self-realization.

---

1. But even then, he is considered to be a Perfect Yogi and Maharshi. 2. This refers to attainment of Salvation. 3. These words should be carefully read. They clearly show that Swami Dayanand had for some time past given up the idea of achieving salvation. How did he then become a perfect Yogi ? 4. Please refer to page 656 of the 'Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand' by Mahāśaya Lakshamaṇa.

72. Whatever has been stated above is mostly from the Autobiography of Swami Dayanand himself, and the rest from the books written by his devoted followers. While writing this, it has been our desire not to omit any thing recorded in his Biography and connected with the practice of *Yoga*. A perusal of the above makes it quite clear how *Yoga* was practised by Swami Dayanand and how far he succeeded in making internal progress. There is no doubt that in the beginning he had a very strong desire to learn the practice of *Yoga*, but because he did not come across any *Guru* who could put him on to the right path, he remained helpless. Ultimately, he became a disciple of Swami Virajanand and, after completing his study of Grammar under him, Swami Dayanand made it the object of his life to preach the Vedic Religion and criticize and condemn idol-worship. It is stated at one place in his Biography written by Mahāśaya Lakshmaṇa that a fair was held in March 1877 at Chandapur, Distt. Shahjahanpur, which was attended by learned scholars of every religion. Swami Dayanand also went to the fair. A certain gentleman, Babu Hargovind Bannerji by name, read out from an English book a statement explaining the method of internal meditation, on hearing which Swami Dayanand said, "God Who is Omnipresent is present everywhere, i.e. no place nor any substance is devoid of Him and as such He is within my spirit too. Why should I then concentrate my attention in my eyes and then meditate at the place where sandal mark is placed on the forehead." (Biography, Page 387).

73. Similarly, in September 1882, when Swami Dayanand was staying in Udaipur State, one morning when he had finished his meditation, the Mahārānā asked :—

جب کسی مورتی‌مان چیز خواہ وہ کیسی ہو آپ نہیں
مانتے ہیں تو پھر دھیان کس کا کریں ؟ سوامی جی نے اُتر دیا
کہ کوئی چیز مان کر دھیان نہیں کرنا چاہئیے- ایشور سروشکتی‌مان
سروسرشٹی‌کرتا اور سرشٹی کو ایک کرم (ضابطہ) میں چلاتے

والا نیینتا - پالن کرتا اور ایسے ھی انیک برھمانڈوں کا سوامی
اور نیینتا - ایسی ایسی اُسکی مہماں کا سمرن کرکے اپنے چت میں
اُس کي مہماں کا دھیان کرنا چاھئیے - ارتھات اسي طرح تمام
وشیشنوں سے یکت پرمیشور کو یاد کرکے اُسکا دھیان کرنا چاھئیے
اور اسکی اپار مہماں کا برنن کرنا - سنسار کے اُپکار میں چت کی
برتی لگانے کی پرارتھنا کرنا - یہ دھیان ھے - (صفحہ ۸۶۷)

'Jab kisī mūrtimān chīz khwāh voh kaisī hī hō āp nahīn mānte, tō dhyān kiskā karen? Swami ji ne uttar diyā ke kōyee chīz mān kar dhyān nahīn karnā chāhiye. Īśvar sarvaśaktimān, sarvasṛishṭikarttā aur sṛishṭi kō ek kram (zābtah) men chalāne vālā niyantā, pālan-kartā aur aise hī anek Brahmāṇḍōn kā Swāmī aur niyantā, aisī aisī uskī mahimā kā smaraṇ karke apne chitt men uskī mahimā kā dhyān karnā chāhiye. Arthāt isī tarah sab viseshaṇōn se yukta Parmeśvara kō yād karke uskā dhyān karnā chāhiye aur uskī apār mahimā kā varṇan karnā sansār ke upkār men chitt kī vṛitti lagāne kī prārthanā karnā—yeh dhyān hai.''
(Complete Biography, 1st Edition, Prishṭh 867).

Translation—

One day in the morning when Swami Dayanand had finished his meditation, Maharana Sahab asked, 'What should one contemplate upon when you do not allow anything material of whatsoever kind it may be? Swamiji replied, 'Contemplation should not be done on the basis of any particular material thing. One should engage himself in the contemplation of the glory of God, remembering His greatness and thinking that God is Omnipotent, Creator of all, and Regulator of the entire creation, Controller, Sustainer and Lord and Controller of many *Brahmandas* and also thinking of such other qualities of His. In other words, one should in this manner, remember all the qualities God is endowed with and contemplate upon Him as possessing those qualities and describing His great glory and applying one's attention to doing good to the world; all this is *Dhyana*.''
(Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand, 1st Edi., P. 867).

74. There is no need of any further comments or remarks. Swami Dayanand peacefully departed from this world on 30th October, 1883. The method of contemplation he taught to the Maharana Sahib of Udaipur, about a year prior to his departure from the world, shows what kind of contemplation Swami Dayanand was accustomed to engage himself in[1]. But has Sage Patanjali described the method of *Yoga* practice in his *Yoga Darśana* like this ? The Arya Samajists should give a reply to this question. The fact of the matter is, as appears from the Biography of Swami Dayanand that —

منم کردہ ام رستم پہلوان - ولیکن یلے بود در سیستاں -

---

1. A few days after writing the above lines, Pt. Viśvabandhu Śāstri's book 'Veda Sandeśa' came to the writer's notice. In the foot-note on page 69 of this book, something pertaining to this subject is written and it appears to be necessary to quote it here. It is stated :—

स्वामी दयानन्द जी ने जब लिखा कि रीढ़ की हड्डी पर ध्यान लगाना चाहिए तो लोग उपहास किया करते थे। पर यह उनकी अपनी मूर्खता का ही विलास था। वहीं तो पूर्वोक्त प्रकार से आत्मा का निवास-स्थान हृदय है और उसी कमल-रूप में प्रतिष्ठित सूक्ष्म आत्मा को अपने अन्दर सूक्ष्मतर प्रभु के दर्शन होते हैं।

Swami Dayanand ji ne jab likhā ki rīḍh ki haḍḍī par dhyān lagānā chāhiye tō lōg upahās kiyā karte the. Par yeh unkī apnī mūrkhtā kā hī vilās thā. Vahīn tō pūrvōkta prakār se Ātmā kā nivās-sthān hṛidaya hai aur usī kamal-rūpa men pratishṭhita sūkshma Ātma kō apne andar sūkshmatar Prabhu ke darśana hōte hain.

Translation—

When Swami Dayanand wrote that one must concentrate his attention at a particular point on the backbone, people used to laugh, but this was only a manifestation of their own ignorance. It is in the backbone that the place of stay of the Ātmā i.e. Hṛidaya is situated and it is that Ātmā stationed in the Lotus of the heart which obtains the Darśana of the Supreme Father, Who is subtler than the Ātmā.

This statement shows that Swami Dayanand at an early stage used to contemplate at some point of his backbone, but later on, probably on account of having failed to achieve anything, his opinion changed as is evident from his Biography.

Manam kardā am Rustame pahalvān, valekin yale būd dar Siestān.

Translation —

I have changed Rustam, who was an ordinary wrestler of Seistan, into the world-famous Rustam.

75. As regards the *Neoli Karma*, the following lines of Guru Arjun Sahab are worth reading :—

न्योली कर्म करे बहु आसन, जैन मारग संजम अते साधन।
निमख निमख कर शरीर कटावे, तौ भी 'हौं' 'मैं' मैल न जावे ॥

Neōlī karma kare bahu āsan, Jain mārag sanjam ate sādhan,
Nimikh nimikh kar śarīr kaṭāve, tau bhī 'haun' 'main' mail nā jāve.

Translation —

Whether a man performs the *Neoli Karma* or he sits in various postures or follows the rules and penances laid down in the Jain Religion and even though he may destroy his body gradually by means of penances, none of these help to remove the dirt of egotism from his mind.

(Sukhmani Sahab[1], Gauṛi Mohalla 5)

VI

SWAMI DAYANAND AND OTHER RELIGIONS

76. Among the books that have been written by Swami Dayanand, Satyārtha Prakāsa occupies a place of special importance. A perusal of the 13th Hindi Edition of this book shows that this book has 630 pages out of which 342 pages have been devoted to criticism of other religions.

1. 'Sukhmanī Sāhab' has been written in 'Ślokas' and 'Ashṭapadīs' by Guru Arjun Sahab, the 5th Leader of the Sikhs. It deals with many religious topics. These lines have been taken from stanza 2 of Ashtapadi 3.

As Swami Dayanand has, on the basis of his information and research, described the mistakes and fallacies of almost all the religions of India, it would be but proper to examine these pages as well, while trying to form an opinion about his internal spiritual status and worldly abilities.

77. Every religion of the world teaches man to love God or the Supreme Being and the follower of every religion, when he is moved by feelings of love or when he finds himself in a state of unusual happiness or pain, remembers God by some name or other and those who have in their hearts deep love for the Supreme Being remember their Beloved Lord again and again, both during day and night, by repeating some name of God which may be dear to them. And

پنج وقت آمد نماز رهنموں - عاشقانش را سلاتے دائموں -

Panj vakt āmad namāze rahnamūn, āshiqānash rā salāte dāyamūn.

Translation —

> Those who follow rules laid down in the religion, perform the '*namaz*' five times a day, but those who love the Lord are engaged in remembering Him all the time.

True devotees are engaged in the repetition of the name of their Beloved Supreme Father throughout the day and night. And it is not a matter about which one needs to enquire from any other person, for every individual whose heart has even the slightest love for the Supreme Lord can state on the basis of his personal experince, that repetition of the sacred Name of the Supreme Father even for a short time gives him such peace and happiness that no other pleasure of the whole world can stand in comparison with it. This is why religious leaders generally have laid particular emphasis on the repetition of some Holy Name. But Swami Dayanand has given expression to an altogether different

opinion in *Sammulas* 11 of the Satyārtha Prakāsa and h written :—

और नामस्मरणमात्र से कुछ भी फल नहीं होता जैसा मिशरी २ कहने से मुँह मीठा और नीम २ कहने से कड़ुवा नहीं होता किन्तु जीभ से चाखने ही से मीठा व कड़ुवापन जाना जाता है ।

(प्रश्न) क्या नाम लेना सर्वथा मिथ्या है जो सर्वत्र पुराणों में नामस्मरण का बड़ा माहात्म्य लिखा है ?

(उत्तर) नाम लेने की तुम्हारी रीति उत्तम नहीं । जिस प्रकार तुम नामस्मरण करते हो वह रीति झूठी है ।

(प्रश्न) हमारी रीति कैसी है ?

(उत्तर) वेद विरुद्ध ।

(प्रश्न) भला अब आप हमको वेदोक्त नामस्मरण की रीति बतलाइये ।

(उत्तर) नामस्मरण इस प्रकार करना चाहिए जैसे 'न्यायकारी' ईश्वर का एक नाम है । इस नाम से जो इसका अर्थ है कि जैसे पक्षपात रहित होकर परमात्मा सबका यथावत् न्याय करता है वैसे उसको ग्रहण कर न्याययुक्त व्यवहार सर्वदा करना, अन्याय कभी न करना । इस प्रकार एक नाम से भी मनुष्य का कल्याण हो सकता है ।

"Aur nām smaraṇa mātra se kuchh bhī phal nahīn hōtā. Jaise ke miśarī miśarī kahne se munh mīṭhā aur nīm nīm kahne se kaṛvā nahīn hōtā, kintu jībh se chākhane hī se mīṭhā va kaṛvāpan jānā jātā hai."

Praśna—"Kyā nām lenā sarvathā mithyā hai jō sarvatra Purāṇōn men nām-smaraṇa kā baṛā māhātmya likhā hai ?"

Uttar —"Nām lene kī tumhārī rīti uttam nahīn. Jis prakār tum nām smaraṇa karte hō, voh rīti jhūṭhī hai."

Praśna—"Hamārī kaisī rītī hai ?"

Uttar —"Veda-viruddh."

Praśna—"Bhalā ab āp hamkō Vedōkta nām-smaraṇa kī rīti batlāyie."

Uttar —"Nām smaraṇa is prakār karnā chāhiye, jaise 'Nyāyakārī' Īśvara kā ek nām hai. Is nām se jō iskā arth hai ke jaise pakshapāta rahit hōkar Paramātmā sabkā yathāvat nyāya

kartā hai, vaise us kō grahaṇa kar nyāyayukta vyavahār sarvadā karnā, anyāya kabhī na karnā. Is prakār ek nām se bhī manushya kā kalyāṇa hō saktā hai."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, Pages 324-325).

Translation—

And mere repetition of the Name does not produce any result, just as by repeating the word *miśri* (i.e. candy') again and again one does not feel the taste of sweetness nor by repeating the word '*neem*', does his taste become bitter. But one experiences sweetness or bitterness only when he tastes sweet or bitter things with his tongue.

Question—Is it altogether useless to repeat the name ? Repetition of the Name has been spoken of in the *Puranas* as of very great importance.

Answer—Your method of repeating the Holy Name is not good. The manner in which you repeat the Name is simply wrong.

Question—What is wrong with our method ?

Answer—It is opposed to the *Vedas*.

Question—Pray, let us kindly know that method of the repetition of the Name which accords with the *Vedas*.

Answer—The repetition of the Name should be done in the manner explained hereafter. For example, the word 'Nyāyakārī' is one Name of God. From this Name one may pick up the quality of being just, which is the meaning of this Name, and just as God does justice to everybody without partiality etc., so you should always do justice and avoid injustice. In this way one Name alone can lead to man's ultimate good.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 13th Hindi Edi. Pp. 324 & 325).

78. The method of meditation of Swami Dayanand has already been described in para 73 and now his methed

of repetition of the Name has also been explained. Swami Dayanand claims that this method is in accordance with the *Vedas*, but does not quote the authority of any *mantras* of the *Vedas* in support of this claim. As a matter of fact, this is the method of meditating upon the qualities of God and not of the repetition of His Name. And if this is the method prescribed in the *Vedas*, obviously Sage Patanjali, who has laid great emphasis in the *Yoga Sutras* on the repetition of the Name 'OM', appears to have committed a serious blunder. But it is not so. Sage Patanjali is in the right. One is led to suspect that Swami Dayanand never himself performed the repetition of the Name; he simply meditated on the qualities of God. Just read what the Ṡvetāṡvatara Upanishad has to say:—

स्वदेहमरणिं कृत्वा प्रणवं चोत्तरारणिम् ।
ध्याननिर्मथनाभ्यासाद् देवम् पश्येन्निगूढवत् ॥ ६—१४

Svadehamaraṇim kṛitvā Praṇavam chōttarāraṇim,
Dhyānanirmathanābhyāsād Devam paśyennigūḍhavat. 9—14

Translation —

Make your body the lower '*Arani*'[1] and make 'Om' the upper '*Arani*' and if you then repeatedly perform the repetition of the Name, you would be able to have the vision of that Great Lord who is hidden within you.

In other words, just as people produce fire by placing a piece of wood below and rubbing another piece of wood from above it, in the same manner should a man rub the the word 'OM' with concentrated attention within his own self. By doing so, the Divine Form of the Lord hidden within him i.e. his own self would become manifest.

---

1. Piece of wood used for kindling fire by rubbing with another similar piece of wood. One 'Araṇi' is called the lower 'Araṇi' and the other, the upper 'Araṇi'.

It may be noted that in the Madhya Pradesh, people living in the hills produce fire in the manner described above. In the same manner, devotees by rubbing in the Name of the Supreme Father within their own self can obtain the Vision of the Lord.

79. The opinion of Swami Dayanand with regard to Guru Nanak Sahab may now be considered :—

नानक जी को आशय तो अच्छा था पर विद्या कुछ भी नहीं थी। हाँ भाषा उस देश की जो कि ग्रामों की है उसे जानते थे। वेदादि शास्त्र और संस्कृत कुछ भी नहीं जानते थे। जो जानते होते तो 'निर्भय' शब्द को 'निर्भौ' क्यों लिखते ? और इसका दृष्टान्त उनका बनाया संस्कृती स्तोत्र है। चाहते थे कि मैं संस्कृत में भी पग अड़ाऊँ। परन्तु बिना पढ़े संस्कृत कैसे आ सकता है ? यह बात अपने मान-प्रतिष्ठा और अपनी प्रख्याति की इच्छा के बिना कभी न करते। उनको अपनी प्रतिष्ठा की इच्छा अवश्य थी, नहीं तो जैसी भाषा जानते थे कहते रहते और यह भी कह देते कि मैं संस्कृत नहीं पढ़ा। जब कुछ अभिमान था तो मान प्रतिष्ठा के लिए कुछ दंभ भी किया होगा। इसीलिए उनके ग्रंथ में जहाँ तहाँ वेदों की निन्दा और स्तुति भी है।

(सत्यार्थ प्रकाश, १३वाँ हिंदी संस्करण, पृ० ३७८)

"Nānak jī kā āśaya tō achchhā thā, parantu vidyā kuchh bhī nahīn thī. Hān bhāshā us deś kī, jō ki grāmōn kī hai, use jānte the. Vedādi Śāstra aur Sanskrit kuchh bhī nahīn jānte the. Jō jānte hōte tō 'nirbhaya' śabda kō 'nirbhau' kyōn likhte ? Aur iskā drishṭānt unkā banāyā Sanskritī stōtra hai. Chāhte the ki main Sanskrit men bhī pag aṛāūn, parantu binā paṛhe Sanskrit kaise ā saktā hai.........Unkō apnī pratishṭhā kī ichchhā avaśya thī, nahīn tō jaisī bhāshā jānte the kahte rahte, aur yeh bhī kah dete ki main Sanskrit nahīn paṛhā. Jab kuchh abhimān thā tō mān pratishṭhā ke liye kuchh dambh bhī kiyā hōgā. Isī liye unke Granth men jahān tahān Vedōn kī nindā aur stuti bhī hai." ityādi.

Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, Page 378)

Translation —

The object of Nanakji was good, but he had no learning at all. Of course, he knew the language of that part of the country, i.e. of the villages where he lived. He had no knowledge at all of the *Vedas* and the *Śastras* or even Sanskrit. If he had known Sanskrit, he would not have written the words निर्भय (*'Nirbhaya'*) as निर्भौ (*'Nirbhau'*). And further proof of this is the *stotra* in plausible Sanskrit that he composed. He wished that he should show off that he knew Sanskrit but how could one know Sanskrit unless one studied it...............He had certainly a desire to get a name, otherwise he could have used the language he knew and could have even stated that he did not know Sanskrit. As he had some pride, he must have made a show of his abilities just for the sake of prestige and honour. This is why he both praised and decried the *Vedas* at different places in his *Granth*.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 13th Hindi Edition, page 378).

80. Evidently, in the opinion of Swami Dayanand, a person who does not know Sanskrit, does not know anything and the person who knows Sanskrit knows everything. The greatest fault of Guru Nanak Sahab was that he did not know Sanskrit. And as he used the word *'Nirbhau'* in place of the word *'Nirbhaya'*, it was not thought necessary to investigate further about his ignorance etc. His second fault was that he had a great desire for his prestige, for if he had no such desire, "he could have simply used the language he knew. And the third fault oJ Guru Nanak Sahb was that he must have made a show of his abilities just for the sake of prestige and honour". But did Guru Nanak Sahab ever claim that he knew Sanskrit ? Swami Dayanand wrote the Satyārtha Prakāsa in Hindi and out of the 630 pages of the book, there is hardly a single page which does not contain some

mistakes of Hindi language. Would it be permitted to the people for this reason to say that Swami Dayanand wanted to show off his knowledge of Hindi? No, never. He used Hindi language so that the Hindu public may get full benefit from his teachings. Similarly, Guru Nanak Sahab delivered his teachings in the language of his part of the country, i.e. in the Punjābī language. The word '*Nirbhau*' on account of which Guru Nanak Sahab has been criticized, is an old Hindi word and is made up of two words: 'Nir' and 'bhau'. The word '*bhau*' is given on page 2603 of Hindi 'Śabda Sāgar', a Dictionary of Hindi published by the Nāgarī-Prachāriṇī Sabhā, Banaras, and the following meaning has been given to it there :—

भौ (संस्कृत 'भय') डर, खौफ़, भय ।

उदाहरण—मेरो भलो कियो राम आपनी भलाई । ... ..

लोक कहें राम को गुलाम हौं कहावौं,

ए तो बड़ो अपराध मन 'भौ' न पावौं । (तुलसी)

Bhau—(Sanskrit 'bhaya') ḍar, khauf, bhaya.

Udaharana—Merō bhalō kiyō Rām āpnī bhalāyee.........
Lōk kahen Rām kō ghulām haun kahāvaun,
etō baṛō aparādh man 'bhau' na pāvaun. (Tulsi)

Translation—

Bhau—(Sanskrit 'Bhaya') fear, dread, apprehension etc. etc.

'Ram did good to me out of His own goodness. People say I am called a slave of Ram. For such a big fault, I do not have any '*fear*' in my mind. (Tulsi)

If a great poet of the status of Tulsi Das used the word '*bhau*' in place of '*bhaya*' and Guru Nanak used the word '*Nirbhau*', a compound of this word, in the *Mangalacharana*[1],

1. In a book of poems and in dramas etc., very often a poem is given at the beginning of a book and this poem either praises the Supreme Lord or the Deity or offers prayers to Him or does both. Such a poem is technically known as a 'Mangalācharaṇa'.

in his book what is there to complain about ? His *Mangalacharana* is not in Sanskrit; it is in the Hindi language. How is it proved that Nanak Sahab was proud and that he desired to acquire name and fame ? Everyone who is acquainted with the Punjabi language, experiences on a mere '*Path*'[1] (recital) of His *Bani*[2] that his heart becomes pure and peaceful, but Swami Dayanand could not know the good qualities of the *Bani* of Nanak Sahab.

81. Guru Nanak Sahab taught the principles of the Religion of Saints. And in the Religion of Saints the position of a *Brahmajnani* is very high. It is for this reason that one occasionally comes across such statements in His *Bani* in praise of *Brahmajnani*, on hearing which people who consider the *Vedas* to be the Highest Knowledge, feel irritated. In any case, in the whole world, Swami Dayanand alone has raised the above objections against the personality of Guru Nanak Sahab and His '*Bani*'. At another place, he has written as below regarding the *Vedanta* Religion, some branches of the Hindu Religion and also about the Religion of Saints established by Kabir Sahab, Nanak Sahab etc :—

یہ سب مذھب بے علمي سے پیدا ھوئے اور علم کے خلاف ھیں -
جاھل - کمینے اور وحشی لوگوں کو بہکا کر اپنے جال میں پھنسا کر
اپني مطلب براري کرتے ھیں -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۴۲۷)

"Yeh sab mazhab be-ilmī se paidā hue aur 'ilm ke khilāf hain. Jāhil, kamīne aur vahshī lōgōn kō bahkā kar apne jāl men phansā kar apnī matlab-barārī karte hain."

(Satyārtha Prakāśā, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 427).

Translation —

All these religions are based on ignorance and are opposed to knowledge. They achieve their selfish ends by entangling ignorant people, people of low mentality and uncivilized people in their net.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 427).

---

1. Vide Note 2 on page 5. 2. Vide Note 2 on page 5.

But how many people among the *Vaishnavas* or the followers of Kabir Sahab and Nanak Sahab did Swami Dayanand find ignorant, low-minded or uncivilized ? If the Founders of these religions converted ignorant, low-minded and uncivilized people who derived no benefit from the *Vedic* Religion, into noble, refined and brave people after taking them under their protection, no evil has been committed.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 427).

82. The opinion of Swami Dayanand regarding the Jain religion may now be perused :—

جینیوں کی مانند سنگ دل - گمراہ - کینہور اور مذمت کرنے
والا اور بھولا ھوا کوئی بھی دوسرے مذھب والا نہ ھوگا - انہوں نے
یہ بات دل میں سوچی ھے کہ اگر ھم دوسروں کی مذمت اور اپنی
تعریف نہ کرینگے تو ھماری خدمت اور تعظیم نہیں ھوگی -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۴۸۴)

"Jainiyōn ke mānind sangdil, gumrāh, kīnāvar, aur muzammat karne vāla aur bhūla huā kōyee bhī dūsre mazhab vālā na hōgā. Unhōn ne yeh bāt dil men sōchī hai ki agar ham dūsrōn kī muzammat aur apnī tārīf na karenge tō hamārī khidmat aur tāzim nahīn hōgī."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition Page 484)

Translation —

There would be no follower of any other religion who would be as hard-hearted, misguided, evil-minded, abusive and misled as the followers of the Jain Religion are. They think that if they do not speak ill of others and praise themselves, people would neither respect them nor serve them"

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 484).

At another place, it is written :—

الغرض یہ لوگ اپنے مذھب کی کتابوں- مقولوں اور سادھوؤں
وغیرہ کی ایسی بڑائیاں مارتے ھیں کہ گویا جینی لوگ بھاٹوں
کے بڑے بھائی ھیں -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحات ۴۸۷ و ۴۸۸)

"Algharaz ye lōg apne mazhab kī kitābōn, maqūlōn aur sādhuōn vagairah kī aisī baṛāyiyān mārte hain ki gōyā Jaini lōg bhāṭōn ke baṛe bhāyee hain."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 487-488).

Translation —

In short, these people praise the books and the discourses of their Religion and their Sadhus to such a great extent that one feels as if the Jains are the elder brothers of *bhats*[1] (minstrels).

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 487-488).

A little further on, it is stated :—

اگر کوئي شخص حاسد اور کینہور بھي ھو تاھم جینیوں سے بڑھ کر وہ بھی نہ ھوگا -

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۴۸۸)

"Agar kōī śakhs hāsid aur kīnāvar bhī hō, tāham Jainiyōn se baṛh kar voh bhī na hōgā."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdū Edition, Page 488).

Translation —

"Even if a person is jealous and evil-minded, he cannot be more so than the Jains."

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 488).

It is strange that people who are afraid of killing even an ant and who spend lacs of rupees on publication of their religious books and distribute them free and who are unequalled as far as charity is concerned, should be called hard-hearted, misguided and evil-minded ! Did Swami Dayanand put in efforts in any way less than those of the Jains in praising the *Vedas* and did he treat the leaders of other religions mildly or tenderly while decrying them ?

1. 'Bhāṭs' are a class of people in India, as their counterparts are elsewhere, who have maintained family histories and genealogies of different princely and other noble families and they sing praises of these families on special occasions.

83. Whatever Swami Dayanand has written about Lord Christ and Christianity is also not less condemnatory. It is stated in St. Matthew's Gospel (Chapter 18—3) :—

> "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

The clear meaning of this is that as long as man is not sorry or repentant for his past sins and does not promise to keep himself free from them in future and determine to lead a life of innocence like that of a small child, he would not be able to get admission into the Kingdom of Heaven i.e. into the August Presence of God. Swami Dayanand has given quite a different meaning to these simple and straightforward statements. He says :—

اور چھوٹے لڑکے کی مانند ہو جانے کی تعلیم دینے سے یہ ظاہر ہوتا ہے کہ یسوع کی باتیں علم اور قانون قدرت کے بالکل خلاف تھیں - اور وہ یہ چاہتا تھا کہ لوگ میری باتوں کو بچوں کی مانند مان لیں اور سوچیں بالکل نہیں - آنکھ بند کرکے مان لیں - علے العموم اگر عیسائیوں کی عقل بچوں کی سی نہ ہوتی تو وہ ایسی بعید ازقیاس اور خلاف از علم باتیں کیوں مانتے ؟ مزید براں یہ بھی ثابت ہوا کہ اگر یسوع آپ خود علم سے محروم اور بچوں کی سی عقل والا نہ ہوتا تو اوروں کو لڑکوں کی مانند بننے کی تعلیم کیوں دیتا ؟ کیونکہ جو جیسا ہوتا ہے وہ اوروں کو بھی ویسا ہی بنانا چاہتا ہے -

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۵۴۴)

"...........Aur chhōṭe laṛke ki mānind hō jāne kī tālīm dene se yeh zāhir hōtā hai ki Yasū kī bāten 'ilm aur qānūn qudrat ke bilkul khilāf thīn. Aur voh yeh chāhtā thā ki lōg merī batōn kō bachchōn kī mānind mān len aur sōchen bilkul nahīn. Ānkh band karke mān len. Al-umūm agar Īsāyiyōn kī aql bachchōn kī sī na hōtī tō ve aisī bayīd-az-qayās aur khilāf-az-'ilm bāten kyōn mānte ? Mazīd barān yeh bhī sābit huā ki agar Yasū āp khud 'ilm se mahrūm aur bachchōn kī sī aql vālā na hōtā tō aurōn

kō laṛkōn kī mānind banāne kī tālīm kyōn detā? Kyōnki jō jaisā hai voh aurōn kō bhī vaisā hī banānā chāhatā hai.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 544).

Translation —

And it is quite apparent from Lord Christ's advice that people should become like small children, that His teachings were opposed to knowledge and laws of nature[1] and He really wanted people to accept His statements like children without thinking about them at all, or using their brains i.e. they should with closed eyes accept everything that Lord Christ said. Obviously, if the intelligence of Christians[2] had not been like that of children, how could they have accepted and believed in such things as are inconceivable and opposed to knowledge. Besides, it is also proved that if Lord Christ Himself had not been devoid of all learning and had not had an intelligence like that of children, he could not have taught people to have an attitude like that of children?[3] For a man wants to make others just like himself.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, page 544).

At another place, it is stated :—

واہ عیسیٰ صاحب ! آپ نے کس علم سے جانا کہ ستارے گر پڑینگے اور آسمان کی کون سي فوج ھے کہ جو گر جائیگي ؟ اگر عیسیٰ تھوڑا بھی علم پڑھا ھوتا تو ضرور جان لیتا کہ یہ ستارے سب دنیا ھیں اور کیونکر گرسکتے ھیں - چونکہ عیسیٰ بڑھئي کے گھر پیدا ھوا تھا - ھمیشہ لکڑي چیرنے چھیلنے - کاٹنے اور جوڑنے کا کام کرتا رھا ھوگا - اُسے اس جنگلي ملک میں جب پیغمبر بننے کا شوق پیدا ھوا تب ایسي باتیں بنانے لگا - کتنی باتیں اُسکے

1. As though Swami Dayanand thought that Lord Christ really taught old and grown-up people to become children of small age. 2. Presumably, all the Christians of all Europe and America! 3. Of course, the objection appears to be like that of wise people.

منہہ سے اچھی بھي نکلیں لیکن بہت سی بری بھي ھیں - وھاں کے
لوگ جنگلی تھے - اس کی باتوں پر یقین کر بیٹھے - جیسا آجکل
یورپ ترقی کر رھا ھے اگر ایسا ھی اُسوقت ھوتا تو اس کے
معجزے کوئي بھی نہ مانتا - باوجود کسي قدر علم ھونے کے
عیسائی لوگ اب بھي ھٹ دھرمی اور پیچیدگی کے معاملات کي
وجہ سے اس ردی مذھب سے کنارہ کش ھوکر مکمل سچائی سے
بھرے ھوئے ویدمارگ کی طرف رجوع نہیں ھوتے- یہی اُن میں
نقص ھے -

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ٥٤٦)

"Vāh Īsā Sāhab—āp ne kis 'ilm se jānā ki sitāre gir paṛenge aur āsmān kī kaun sī fauj hai jō gir jāyegi ? Agar Īsā thōṛā bhī 'ilm paṛhā hōtā tō zarūr jān letā ki yeh sitāre sab duniyā hain aur kyōnkar gir sakte hain. Chūnki Īsā baṛhayee ke ghar paidā huā thā, hameśā lakṛī chīrne, chhīlne, kāṭne aur jōṛne kā kām kartā rahā hōgā, use is janglī mulk men jab paighambar banane kā shauq paidā huā tab aisī bāten banāne lagā. Kitnī bāten uske munh se achchhī bhī niklīn lekin bahut sī burī bhī hain. Vahān ke lōg janglī the. Uskī bātōn par yaqīn kar baiṭhe.................. Bāvajūd kisī qadar[1] 'ilm hōne ke Īsāyee lōg ab bhī haṭdharmī aur pechīdgī ke muāmlāt kī vajah se is raddī mazhab se kinārākash hōkar mukammal sachāyee se bhare huye Vedamārg kī taraf rujū nahīn hōte. Yehī unmen nuqs hai."
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 546).

Translation —

Well done, Christ ! What is that science with the help of which you have guessed that stars will fall and what army is there in the sky that will fall down ? If Christ had even a little education, He should have known that all these stars are themselves different worlds and they cannot fall. But as Christ was born in the home of a carpenter, he must have remained engaged in sawing, scraping, cutting, and joining pieces of timber and therefore when the desire to assume the role of a prophet in that wild and uncivilized country arose in his mind, He began to talk like

that. There were many good things that he said, but many bad things were also said by him. The people there were uncivilized, so they believed what He said. Inspite of the fact that they have some learning,[1] Christians even now, on account of their obstinacy and the intricacies of the matter do not leave their useless religion and are not attracted towards the Religion of the *Vedas* which is perfect and full of truth. This is the defect they have.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 540).

As Lord Christ was born in the home of a carpenter, Swami Dayanand thought that all his life He must have sawn, scraped, cut and joined pieces of timber, but if inferences are drawn in this manner regarding the Founder of any religion or even about Swami Dayanand Himself, the things they said would appear to be merely irresponsible and foolish talk. Was Lord Christ really as ignorant as Swami Dayanand wants to present Him ? Is it really an evidence of a person's lack of knowledge or his having a child's imperfect intelligence, if he advises people to have an innocent heart like that of a child or himself has such an innocent heart ?

84. The following questions and answers pertaining to Chapter I of the Bible i.e. the Genesis[2] are also worth perusal :—

محقق—ابتدا کسے کہتے ہیں ؟

عیسائی—دنیا کی پہلی پیدایش کو -

محقق—کیا یہی پہلی پیدایش ہے اور اسکے پہلے کبھی نہیں ہوئی؟

---

1. As compared to the Aryans of India !
2. The text of the original is :—

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. (Genesis, I-1)

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. (Genesis, I-2)

عیسائی—ہم نہیں جانتے کہ ہوئی یا نہیں - خدا جانے ۔

محقق—اگر نہیں جانتے تو اس کتاب پر ایمان کیوں لائے ؟ جس (کتاب) سے شکوک رفع نہیں ہو سکتے اُسکی بنا پر لوگوں کو وعظ کرکے پر از شکوک مذہب میں کیوں پھنساتے ہو ؟ اور تمام شکوک سے پاک سب شکوک کے رفع کرنے والے وید مت کو قبول کیوں نہیں کرتے ؟ جب تم خدا کی خلقت کا حال نہیں جانتے تو خدا کو کیسے جانتے ہوگے ؟

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۵۱۵)

Muhaqqiq—Ibtidā kise kahte hō ?

Isāī— Duniyā kī pahlī paidāyish kō.

Muhaqqiq—Kyā yehī pahlī paidāyish hai aur iske pahle kabhī nahīn huyee ?

Isāī— Ham nahīn jānte ki huyee yā nahīn, Khudā jāne.

Muhaqqiq—Agar nahīn jānte tō is Kitāb par īmān kyōn lāye ? Jis (Kitāb) se shakūk rafā nahīn hō sakte uskī binā par lōgōn kō vā'az karke pur az shakūk mazhab men kyōn phansāte hō ? Aur tamām shakūk se pāk, sab shakūk ke rafā karne vāle Veda mat kō qabūl kyōn nahīn karte ? Jab tum Khudā kī khalqat kā hāl nahīn jānte tō Khudā kō kaise jānte hōge ?"

(Satyārth Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 515).

Translation—

Critic—'What is meant by 'origin of creation' ?

Christian—'First manifestation of the world'.

Critic—'Is this the first creation and was there no creation before this ?'

Christian—'We do not know whether there was any creation before this or not. God alone knows'.

Critic—'If you do not know, why have you put faith in this Book which is full of doubts and uncertainties and why do you entangle people in this religion, on the basis of the Book which cannot remove doubts and uncertainties ? And

> why do you not accept the Religion of the *Vedas*, which is free from all doubts and uncertainties and which can remove all doubts? When you do not know anything about the creation of God, how would you possibly know God Himself.'
> (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 515).

But do all the followers of the Religion of *Vedas* know much about the creation of God? And is it that all the teachings of Christ and the Christian religion are false simply because a particular Christian was unable to give answers to the questions of Swami Dayanand? If this is taken to be the guiding principle, would not a perusal of the following words of *Rig-Veda Mandala* 10, *Sukta* 129[1], most probably make one think that the *Vedas* are full of doubtful expressions and false teachings:—

> जिस से यह सृष्टि हुई, आया उसने स्वयं इस सब को रचा या नहीं रचा—यह बात वह जो परम व्योम (सबसे ऊँचे आकाश) में मुक़ीम रह कर सृष्टि की निगहदाश्त करता है ठीक ठीक जानता होगा और संभव है वह न जानता हो।

> "Jis se yeh sṛishṭi huyī, āyā usne svayam is sabkō rachā yā nahīn rachā?—Yeh bāt Voh jō param vyōm (sabse ūnche ākāśa) men muqīm rah kar sṛishṭi kī nigahdāsht kartā hai ṭhīk ṭhīk jāntā hōgā aur sambhav hai Voh na jāntā hō."

Translation—

Did He, from Whom all this creation manifested itself, create all this or did He not? This may probably be known correctly to Him Who dwells in the highest

---

1. Refer to para 186 of Yathārtha Prakāśa Part II. The original Sanskrit text is:—

इयं विसृष्टिर्यत आबभूव यदिवादधे यदिवा न।
यो अस्याध्यक्षः परमे व्योमन्त्सोअङ्ग वेद यदिवा न वेद॥ (१०-१२९-७)

Iyam visṛishṭiryata ābabhūva yadivādadhe yadivā na,
Yō asyādhyakshah parame vyōmantsō anga veda yadivā na veda, (10-129-7)

Heaven and from there looks after the entire creation. And possibly, He may not be knowing this.

85. It is stated regarding St. Matthew's Gospel (Chapter I, 18—20[1]) :—

ان باتوں کو کوئي عالم نہیں مان سکتا کہ جو پرتیکش
وغیرہ پرمانوں اور قانون قدرت کے خلاف ہیں - ان باتوں کا
ماننا بے علم غیر مہذب آدمیوں کا کام ھے شایستہ اور عالموں کا
کام نہیں - بھلا جو خدا کا قانون ھے اس کو کوئي توڑ سکتا ھے ؟
اگر خدا ھی قانون کو رد و بدل کرے تو اس کا حکم کوئی نہ مانے۔
(ستیارتھ پرکاش چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن صفحہ ۵۳۸)

"Un bātōn kō kōyee 'ālim nahīn mān saktā ki jō pratyaksh vagairah pramāṇōn aur qānūn qudrat ke khilāf hain. In bātōn kā mānanā be-'ilm gairmuhazzib ādamiyōn kā kām hai; Shāyastā aur ālimōn kā nahīn. Bhalā jō Khudā kā qānūn hai uskō kōyee tōṛ saktā hai? Agar Khudā hī qānūn kō radd-ō-badal kare tō uskā hukm kōyee na māne."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 538).

Translation —

No learned man can accept those things, which are opposed to direct knowledge and laws of nature. Only the uneducated or uncivilized people can accept these things and not civilized and learned people. Can anybody go against the laws of God? If God Himself makes any changes in His own laws, obviously nobody would then care to obey Him.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, page 538).

---

1. The text of the original is :—

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. (Matt. I-18) Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. (Matt. I-19) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost". (Matt. I-20)

Here the subject of discussion is the birth of Lord Christ and it has been stated that Lord Christ was born of the Holy Ghost[1]. Swami Dayanand says that this is opposed to the laws of nature. It is for the Christians themselves to say how far this description in the Holy Bible is correct. Our question is that if, as Swami Dayanand has stated, thousands and lacs of young men and women were created in the beginning of the creation by God without the help of parents, why should the birth of only one child without the help of father be considered opposed to the laws of nature? And if it is the law of nature that children be born only through father and mother, why did God break this law in the beginning of the creation?

86. Further on, some portions of this very Gospel have been criticized. One of them reads as below:—

> "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of Heaven. (St. Matthew, V-3).

Swami Dayanand writes about this as follows:—

اگر آسمان یعنی بہشت ایک ہے تو اس کا بادشاہ بھی ایک ہی ہونا چاہئیے - اس لئے جتنے دل کے غریب ہیں اگر وے سب بہشت کو جاوینگے تو بہشت میں سلطنت کا حق کس کا ہوگا ؟ وہ باہم لڑائی جھگڑا کرینگے اور سلطنت کا انتظام درہم برہم ہو جائیگا - اور لفظ غریب سے اگر کنگال مراد لوگے تو درست نہیں اگر اس سے مراد حلیم لوگے تو بھی درست نہیں کیونکہ کنگال اور حلیم کے معنی ایک نہین بلکہ جو دل میں غریب ہوتا ہے اس کو صبر کبھی نہیں ہوتا - اس لئے یہ بات درست نہین -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن صفحہ ۵۳۹ و ۵۴۰)

---

1. Holy Ghost is the same as the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Christian Trinity, viz, God, Son and Holy Spirit. Holy Spirit is said to be the Comforter or Advocate promised by Christ to abide with and guide His disciples.

"Agar āsmān yānī bahisht ek hai tō uskā bādshāh bhī ek hī hōnā chāhiye. Is liye jitne dil ke gharīb hain agar ve sab bahisht kō jāvenge, tō bahisht men saltanat kā haq kiskā hōgā? Voh bāham laṛāyee jhagaṛā karenge aur saltanat kā intizām darham barham hō jāyegā. Aur lafz gharīb se agar kangāl murād lōge tō durust nahīn. Agar us se murād halīm lōge, tō bhī durust nahīn, kyōnki kangāl aur halīm ke mānī ek nahīn balke jō dil men gharīb hōtā hai uskō sabar kabhī nahīn hōtā. Is liye yeh bāt durust nahīn.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 539-540).

Translation —

If there is one Heaven or Paradise, it should have one ruler too. Therefore if all those who are poor in spirit, go to Heaven, who would have the right to rule in Heaven? They would all fight among themselves and the 'law and order' position in the Kingdom would be disturbed. And if you interpret the word 'poor' as meaning penniless, it would not be correct. Similarly, if you take the word to mean one who is 'gentle', it would again be incorrect, because the words 'penniless' and 'gentle' do not mean one and the same thing, for he who is poor in spirit, is never contented and therefore it would not be correct to interpret the words in this way.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 539-540)

This objection is really very extraordinary. The meaning of the expression 'Kingdom of God' is nothing but *Svarga*'[1] and the words 'poor in spirit' signify nothing else but people humble in heart or those free from egotism. Is it really the case that those who are free from egotism are discontented? And is it for this reason that our kind friends take so much pride in egotism?

87. Now some examples of the objections raised against Islam are mentioned here.

1. 'Svarga' means Heaven.

Everybody knows that the Holy Quran begins with the phrase 'بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم' (Bismillāh-ur-Rahmān-ur-Rahīm) and in consonance with this, Muslims write these words at the beginning of their books. The meaning of these words is "We begin with the name of Allāh, Who is extremely Kind and Merciful". But Swami Dayanand has drawn strange inferences from this. He writes :—

> لیکن اس قول سے معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ اس کا بنانے والا کوئی
> دوسرا ہے کیونکہ اگر خدا کا بنایا ہوتا تو 'شروع ساتھ نام اللہ کے'
> ایسا نہ کہتا بلکہ 'شروع واسطے ہدایت انسانوں کے' ایسا کہتا -
> (ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۵۶۴)

> "Lekin is qaul se mālūm hōtā hai ki iskā banāne wālā kōyee dūsrā hai kyōnki agar Khudā kā banāyā hōtā tō 'shurū sāth nām Allāh ke' aisā na kahtā balke 'shurū vāste hidāyat insānōn ke' aisā kahtā."
>
> (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 564).

Translation —

> But it appears from this expression that the author of this[1] is somebody else, for if God had been the author, He would not have used the words "We begin with the name of Allāh, Who is extremely Kind and Merciful" ; but He would have said, 'For the edification of human beings, etc.'
>
> (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, page 564).

But even in the *Vedas*, the highest name of *Brahma*, viz, 'OM', has been used first of all. Thus the objection which has been raised against the Holy Quran applies in the case of the Sacred *Vedas* as well. When it is said that the prayers and the statements in the Sacred *Vedas* have been made in that way to show the way to human beings, Muslims should also have the right to say that God Almighty used in the beginning of the Holy Quran such words as He wanted human beings to follow.

---

1. Of the Holy Qurān.

88. It is written regarding Sipārā[1] I, Sūrat-ul-Baqar[2], Āyat[3] 36:—

جب هم نے فرشتوں سے کہا سجدہ کرو آدم کو - پس سب نے
سجدہ کیا - پر شیطان نے نه مانا اور تکبر کیا کیونکه وہ بھی ایک
کافر تھا (سپارہ اول سورۃ البقر - آیت ۳۶)

محقق—اس سے (ثابت هوا که) خدا همهدان نهیں یعنی
ماضی- حال - مستقبل کی باتیں پورے طور پر نهیں جانتا - اگر
جانتا تو شیطان کو پیدا هی کیوں کیا اور خدا میں کچھ جلال
بھی نهیں هے کیونکه شیطان نے خدا کا حکم هی نه مانا اور خدا
اسکا کچھ بھی نه کر سکا - اور دیکھئے ایک کافر شیطان نے خدا کے
بھی چھکے چھڑا دئے - پس مسلمانوں کے خیال میں جہاں کروڑوں
کافر هیں وهاں مسلمانوں کے خدا اور مسلمانوں کی کیا پیش
چل سکتی هے - کبھی کبھی خدا بھی کسی کی بیماری بڑھا دیتا اور
کسی کو گمراہ کر دیتا هے- خدا نےیه باتیں شیطان سے سیکھی هونگی
اور شیطان نے خدا سے - کیونکه سوائے خدا کے شیطان کا استاد
اور کوئی نهیں هو سکتا -

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحه ۵۶۸)

"Jab ham ne farishtōn se kahā—Sijdā karō ādam kō. Pas sabne sijdā kiyā per shaitān ne na mānā aur takabbur kiyā kyōnki voh bhī ek kāfir thā' (Ayat 36). Is se (sābit huā ke) Khudā hamadān nahīn yānī māzī, hāl, mustqbil kī bāten pūre taur par nahīn jāntā. Agar jantā tō shaitān kō paidā hī kyōn kiyā. Aur Khudā men kuchh jalāl bhī nahīn thā kyōnki Shaitān ne Khudā kā hukam hī na mānā aur Khudā uskā kuchh bhī na kar sakā. Aur dekhiye ek kāfir Shaitān ne Khudā ke bhī chhakke chhuṛā diye. Pas Musalmānōn ke khyāl men jahān karōṛōn kāfir hain vahān Musalmānō ke Khudā aur Musalmānōn kī kyā pesh chal saktī hai? Kabhī kabhī Khudā bhī kisī kī bīmarī baṛhā detā aur kisī kō gumrāh kar detā hai. Khudā ne yeh bāten Shaitān se sīkhī hōngīn aur Shaitān ne Khudā se, kyōnki sivāye Khudā ke Shaitān kā ustād aur kōyee nahīn hō saktā." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 568)

---

1. 'Sipārā' means part or section. 2. There are 114 Chapters in Holy Qurān and these are known as 'Sūrah' or Sūrat. 'Sūrat-ul-Baqar' is one of them. 3. 'Āyat' means a verse of the Holy Qurān.

Translation —

"When We said to the angels—'Make obeisance to 'man', everyone made obeisances, but Satan did not agree to do so and remained proud because he too was an unbeliever'.' (Āyat 36). This shows that God is not omniscient, i. e. He does not know fully well everything about the past, the present and the future. If He had known everything, why should He have created Satan? And there appears to be nothing awe-inspiring about God, because Satan did not obey the orders of God and God could not do anything against him. And strange though it is, the unbeliever Satan put God in a very sad plight. Thus when, according to the Muslims, there are millions of unbelievers, what can the Muslims and their God do? Sometimes even God increases the sickness of a person and sometimes he misleads another person. Obviously God must have learnt these things from Satan and Satan must have learnt them from God, for nobody excepting God can be the teacher of Satan."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 568).

But even in the Śvetāśvatara[1] Upanishad, it is stated that Maheśvara[2] i.e. the Lord of *Maya*[3] spreads the net of *Maya* and the poor *Jiva*, entangled in *Maya*, finds himself tied down to the things of *Maya*[4]. And in *śloka* 61 of Chapter 18 of the

---

1. The Śvetāśvatara Upanishad pertains to Kṛishna Yajur-Veda and is believed to be the work of a Rishi named Śvetāśvatara. The word means 'one who has a white mule'. 2. Supreme Lord. 3. The word 'Māyā' is generally taken to mean illusion, i.e. something which does not allow 'reality' to be seen. In the Religion of Saints, it appears as Prakṛiti or matter which prevents man from having knowledge of truth.
4. The original Sanskrit Śloka is:

मायां तु प्रकृति विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्।
तस्यावयवभूतैस्तु व्याप्तं सर्वमिदं जगत्॥ ४—१०

Māyām tu Prakṛiti vidyānmāyinam tu Maheśvaram,
Tasyāvayavabhūtaistu vyāptam sarvamidam jagat. 4—10

Bhagvad Gita, it is even more clearly stated that God dwells in the heart of all the *Jivas* and is whirling all of them round by means of his *Maya*, as if all the *Jivas* are riding the potter's wheel[1]. And as regards Satan not obeying the orders of God and putting God in a sad plight, the only thing that needs to be stated is that even now thousands and millions of people commit sins and neither Brahma nor Para-Brahma can evidently do anything to prevent this.

89. There is a description of Heaven in *Sipara 3*, Sūrat-ul-Umrān, Āyat 12. It is stated there :—

کہہ دیں دون اس سے بہتر خبر پرھیزگاروں کوکہ اللہ کے پاس
بہشتیں ھیں جن میں نہریں چلتی ھیں- ان میں ھمیشہ رھنے والی
پاک بیبیاں ھیں - اللہ کی خوشی ھے - اللہ دیکھتا ھے اپنے
بندوں کو -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحات ۵۸۰ و ۵۸۱)

'Kah den dūn is se behtar khabar parhezgārōṇ kō ki Allāh ke pās bahishten hain, jinmen nahren chaltī hain. Unmen hameśā rahne vālī pāk bībiyān hain. Allāh kī khushī hai, Allāh dekhtā hai apne bandōn kō.'

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 580-581)

Translation—

Tell this good news to those who keep themselves under restraint that God has many Heavens where canals flow and there are chaste wives who live there permanently. It is God's pleasure, God sees (to the happiness of) his children.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 580-581)

Swami Dayanand has made the following remarks on this :—

محقق—بھلا یہ بہشت ھے یا طوائف خانہ ؟ اسکو خدا کہیں

1. The original Sanskrit Ślōka is given in Para 170 of Part II of Yathārtha Prakāśa.

یا سترین (عورتوں کا دلدادہ)؟ کیا کوئی بھی عقلمند ایسی
باتیں جس میں ہوں اُسکو خدا کی بنائی کتاب مان سکتا ہے؟
خدا طرفداری کیوں کرتا ہے؟ جو بیبیاں بہشت میں ہمیشہ سے
رہتی ہیں کیا وہ یہاں سے پیدا ہوکر وہاں گئی ہیں یا وہیں
پیدا ہوئی ہیں؟ اگر یہاں سے پیدا ہوکر وہاں گئی ہیں اور
قیامت کی رات سے پہلے ہی وہاں بیبیوں کو بلا لیا تو اُن کے
خاوندوں کو کیوں نہ بلا لیا اور 'قیامت کی رات میں سب کا
انصاف ہوگا' - اس عہد کو کیوں توڑا - اگر وہیں پیدا ہوئی ہیں
تو قیامت تک کیوں کر گذارہ کرتی ہیں؟ اگر ان کے واسطے آدمی
بھی ہیں - یہاں سے بہشت میں جانے والے مسلمانوں کو خدا بیبیاں
کہاں سے دیگا؟ اور جیسے بیبیاں بہشت میں (ہمیشہ رہنے والی)
بنائیں ویسے مردوں کو وہاں ہمیشہ رہنے والے کیوں نہیں بنایا؟
اس واسطے مسلمانوں کا خدا بھی بے انصاف اور بے سمجھ ہے -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۵۸۱)

Muhaqqiq—Bhalā yeh bahisht hai yā tavāyafkhānā? Iskō Khudā kahen yā Straiṇa (Striyōn kā dildādah)? Kyā kōyee bhī aqlmand aisī bāten jismen hōn uskō Khudā kī banāyee Kitāb mān saktā hai? Khudā tarafdārī kyōn kartā hai? Jō bībiyān bahisht men hameshā se rahtī hain, kyā ve yahān se paidā hōkar vahān gayee hain yā vahīn paidā huyee hain? Agar yahān se paidā hōkar vahān gayee hain aur qayāmat kī rāt se pahle hī vahān bībiyōn kō bulā liyā tō unke khāvindōn kō kyōn na bulā liyā? Aur 'qayāmat kī rāt men sabkā insāf hōgā'—is ahad kō kyōn tōṛā? Agar vahīn paidā huyī hain tō qayāmat tak ve kyōnkar guzārā kartī hain? Agar unke vāste ādmī bhī hain, yahān se bahisht men jāne vāle musalmānōn kō Khudā bībiyān kahān se degā? Aur jaise bībiyān bahisht men (hameśā rahne vālī) banāīn, vaise mardōn kō vahān hameśā rahne vāle kyōn nahīn banāyā? Is vāste Musalmānōn kā Khudā bhī be-insāf aur be-samajh hai." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 581)

Translation —

Critic—Well, is this Heaven or a brothel? Should we call him God or a lover of women? Can

any intelligent man accept the book, which contains all these statements as God's revelation ? Why is God partial ? Did the women who have been permanently living in Heaven go from here or were they born in Heaven ? If they were born here and then sent to Heaven, obviously God called those women to Heaven before the Domesday ? But why did He not call their husbands also ? 'Justice', it is said, 'will be meted out to every one on the night of the Domesday'—Why has this promise been broken by God ? If these women were born in Heaven, how do they afford to live there alone till the Domesday ? If there are men-folk for them already there, whence would God supply women to Muslims who would go from here ? Just as God has made women permanent residents of Heaven, why did He not make men also permanent residents there ?" Thus God of Mohammedans is also unjust and unintelligent.

But it is said that there are women in *Brahma Loka* too. It is stated in *Prapathaka*[1] 8, *Khanda*[2] 12 of Chhāndogya Upanishad[3] that man's spirit becomes purified on reaching *Brahma Loka* and there on coming into contact with the *Parama Jyoti* (Great Light) manifests itself in its real form[4]. (The expression '*Parama Jyoti*' means *Para-Brahma*). And there—

वह इस शरीर को, जिसमें वह जन्मा था, स्मरण न करता हुआ वहाँ स्त्रियों के यानों के वा ज्ञातियों के साथ हँसता (वा खाता,) खेलता और आनन्द भोगता हुआ विचरता है।

(छान्दोग्य उपनिषद् पं० राजारामकृत, प्रथम संस्करण, १६०७, पृष्ठ ३०६)

---

1. Vide Note 2 on page 21.
2. Vide Note 9 on page 27.
3. Vide Note 3 on page 21.
4. The original Sanskrit text is

तद्यथैतान्यमुष्मादाकाशात् समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरुपसम्पद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यन्ते ॥ (८—१२—२)

'Tadyathaitānyamushmādākāśāt samutthaya parama jyotirupasampadya svena rūpeṇābhinishpadyante'. (8—12—2)

"Voh is śarīr kō, jismen voh janmā thā, smaraṇa na kartā huā vahān striyōn ke yānōn ke vā jñātiyōn ke sāth hanstā (vā khātā) kheltā aur ānand bhōgatā huā vichartā hai."

(Chhānd. Upa. by Pt. Raja Ram, 1st Edition, Page 309).

Translation —

The spirit in the Heaven, not remembering the body in which it had been born, moves about, laughing and joking and enjoying with the processions of ladies or persons acquainted with it.[1]

(Chhand. Upa. by Pt. Raja Ram, 1st Edition, P. 309).

Besides this, while describing the result of '*Vishtari Yajna*'[2] in *Sukta* 35, *Kanda* 4 of *Atharva-Veda*, it is stated :—

हड्डियों से रहित हुए, निर्मल हुए, पवित्र करने वाले से पवित्र किए हुए, चमकते हुए वे (याज्ञिक) चमकते हुए लोक की ओर जाते हैं। जातवेदा (अग्नि) उनके शिश्न को नहीं जलाता है। स्वर्गलोक में बहुत स्त्री समूह उनका होता है। (मंत्र २)

जो विष्टारी ओदन को पकाते हैं उनको अजीविका (दरिद्रता) कभी नहीं चिमटती, (ऐसा पुरुष) यम के पास बैठता है, देवों की ओर जाता है, सोम पीने वाले गंधर्वों के साथ आनन्द मनाता है। (मंत्र ३)

विष्टारी ओदन को जो पकाते हैं यम उनके बीज को उनसे नहीं छीनता है। वह रथों का स्वामी होकर रथ के मार्गों पर घूमता है और पक्षी होकर सारे आकाशों को उलांघ जाता है। (मंत्र ४)

...विष्टारी को पका कर वह स्वर्ग में प्रवेश करता है.........ये

---

1. The original Sanskrit text is :—

स तत्र पर्येति जक्षत् क्रीडन् रममाणः स्त्रीभिर्वा यानैर्वा ज्ञातिभिर्वा नोपजनँ स्मरन्निदँ शरीरँ स यथा प्रयोग्य आचरणे युक्त एवमेवायमस्मिञ्छरीरे प्राणो युक्तः। (८—१२—३)

'Sa tatra paryeti jakshat krīḍan ramamāṇah strībhirvā yānairvā jñātibhirvā nōpajanaṅsmarannidaṅ śarīraṅ sa yathā prayōgya ācharṇe yukta evamevāyamasmiñchharīre prāṇō yuktah. (8—12—3)

2. The 'Vishṭhārī Yajña' is the sacrifice in which 'Vishṭārī' is offered as obtations.

सारी धाराएँ, मधुवाली होकर पुष्ट हुईं, स्वर्गलोक में तुझे मिलें और चारों ओर वर्तमान कमलों वाले सरोवर तुझे मिलें। (मंत्र ५)

घी के हृदों वाले, मधु के किनारों वाले, सुरा के पानियों वाले, दूध से, पानी से, दही से भरे हुए, ये सारी धाराएँ। (मंत्र ६)

Haḍḍiyōn se rahit huye, nirmal huye, pavitra karne vāle se pavitra kiye huye, chamakte huye ve (yājṇika) chamakte huye lōka kī ōr jāte hain. Jātvedā (Agni) unke śiśna kō nahīn jalātā hai. Svaragalōka men bahut strī samūh unkā hōtā hai. (Mantra 2).

Jō Vishṭārī ōdan kō pakāte hain, unkō ajīvikā (daridratā) kabhī nahīn chimaṭatī, (aisā purush) Yama ke pās baiṭhatā hai, devōn kī ōr jātā hai, sōma pīne vāle Gandharvōn ke sāth ānand manātā hai. (Mantra 3).

Vishṭārī ōdan kō jō pakāte hain, Yama unke bīj kō unse nahīn chhīntā hai. Voh rathōn kā swāmī hōkar rath ke mārgōn par ghūmatā hai aur pakshī hōkar sāre akāśōn kō ulāngh jātā hai. (Mantra 4).

"............Vishṭārī kō pakā kar voh Svarga men praveśa kartā hai.........Ye sārī dhārāen, madhuvālī hō kar pushṭ huyīn, Svargalōka men tujhe milen, aur chārōn ōr vartamān kamlōn vāle sarōvar tujhe milen. (Mantra 5)

Ghī ke hṛidōn vāle, madhu ke kinārōn vāle, surā ke pāniyōn vāle, dūdh se, pānī se, dahī se bhare huye ye sārī dhārāen. (Mantra 6)

Translation —

These sacrificers, deprived of their bones, purified and sanctified by the sanctifier, go towards the region which is shining. The fire does not burn their urinary organs. A large number of women are available to them in Heaven. (*Mantra* 2)[1]

---

1. The original Sanskrit text is :—

अनस्थाः पूताः पवनेन शुद्धाः शुचयः शुचिमपि यन्ति लोकम् ।
नैषां शिश्नं प्रदहति जातवेदाः स्वर्गे लोके बहु स्त्रैणमेषाम् ॥ (४—३४—२)

Anasthāḥ pūtāḥ pavanena śuddhāḥ śuchayaḥ śuchimapi yanti lōkam,
Naishām śiśnam pradahati jātavedāḥ svarge lōke bahu straiṇameshām.
(4—34—2)

Those who cook the *Vishtari* rice[1] never become poor. Such a person sits by the side of *Yama*[2], goes to the gods, enjoys the company of the *Gandharvas*[3] who drink *Soma*[4]. (*Mantra* 3)[5].

Yama does not remove the semen of those who cook the *Vishtari* rice. He becomes the Master of Chariots and moves about on chariot roads and flies through the whole atmosphere like a bird. (*Mantra* 4)[6].

He enters the *Svarga Loka* after cooking the *Vishtari*. All these currents will become the currents of honey and will swell and will be available to you in Heaven, and you may come across pools of water full of lotus flowers on all sides. (*Mantra* 5)[7].

These ponds full of ghee, with their banks of honey and with wine flowing like water, with milk,

---

1. A specially cooked rice of which oblations were offered in a special sacrifice. 2. God of Death. 3. Vide Note 2 on page 102. 4. Vide Note 4 on page 28.

5. The original Sanskrit text is :—

विष्टारिणमोदनं ये पचन्ति नैनानवर्तिः सचते कदाचन ।
आस्ते यम उप याति देवान्त्सं गन्धर्वैर्मदते सोम्येभिः ॥ (४—३४—३)

Vishṭāriṇamōdanam ye pachanti nainānavartiḥ sachate kadāchana,
Āste Yama upa yāti devāntsam Gandharvairmadate sōmyebhiḥ. (4—34—3)

6. The original Sanskrit text is :—

विष्टारिणमोदनं ये पचन्ति नैनान् यमः परिमुष्णाति रेतः ।
रथी ह भूत्वा रथयान ईयते पक्षी ह भूत्वाति दिवः समेति ॥ (४—३४—४)

Vishṭāriṇamōdanam ye pachanti nainān Yamaḥ parimushṇāti retaḥ,
Rathī ha bhūtvā rathayāna Īyate pakshī ha bhūtvāti divaḥ sameti.(4—34—4)

7. The original Sanskrit text is :—

.........विष्टारिणं पक्त्वा दिवमा विवेश...............
एतास्त्वा धारा उप यन्तु सर्वाः स्वर्गे लोके मधुमत् पिन्वमाना उप त्वा
तिष्ठन्तु पुष्करिणीः समन्ताः ॥ (४—३४—५)

...............Vishṭāriṇam paktvā divamā viveśa...............
Etāstvā dhārā upa yantu sarvāḥ svarge lōke madhumat
pinvamānā upa tvā tishṭhantu pushkariṇīḥ samantāḥ. (4—34—5)

water and curds. All these currents may be available to you, etc. (*Mantra* 6)[1].

There are also women in Heaven besides chariots, water tanks, lotuses, honey, curds, milk, also ghee and even wine. Perhaps, it would not suffice to call such a place a BROTHEL only.

90. In Kanda 20, *Sukta* 126 of this same *Veda*, the dialogue between, Indra, Indrāṇī (Indra's wife) and Vrishākapi[2] is recorded. In that dialogue, it is stated at one place :—

पर्शु नाम मनु की कन्या ने बीस (पुत्रों) को इकट्ठा जन्म दिया।
निस्सन्देह यह उसका भला हुआ यद्यपि उसने उसके उदर को पीड़ित किया। (अथर्ववेद भाष्य पं० राजाराम कृत, पृष्ठ ६६१)

"Parśu nām Manu kī kanyā ne bīs (putrōn) kō ikaṭṭhā janma diyā. Nissandeh yeh uskā bhalā huā yadyapi usne uske udar kō pīḍit kiyā." (Mantra 23)
(Atharva-Veda Bhāshya by Pandit Raja Ram, Prishṭha 991).

Translation —

Manu's daughter, Parśu by name, gave birth to twenty children at one and the same time. Undoubtedly this was very good of her, though this caused pain in her womb[3]. (Mantra 23)
(Atharva-Veda Bhāshya by Pt. Raja Ram, P. 991)

---

1. The original Sanskrit text is :—
घृतह्रदा मधुकूलाः सुरोदकाः क्षीरेण पूर्णा उदकेन दध्ना (४—३४—६)
Ghṛitahṛidā madhukūlāḥ surōdakāḥ kshīreṇa pūrṇā udakena dadhnā. (4—34—6)

2. Man-ape, a semi-divine being mentioned in a special relationship with god Indra. 3. The original Sanskrit text is :—
पर्शुर्ह नाम मानवी साकं ससूव विंशतिम्।
भद्रं भल त्यस्या अभूद् यस्या उदरमामयद् विश्वस्मादिन्द्र उत्तरः॥ (२०-१२६-२३)
Parśurha nāma mānavī sākam sasūva vinśatim,
Bhadram bhala tyasyā abhūd yasyā udaramāmayad viśvasmādindra uttarah. (20-126-23)

In what region are twenty babies born in one lot? Obviously, this description cannot refer to this earth and it is not a matter which can just be passed over lightly, for in *mantras* 15 and 16 of this very *Sukta*, Indrāṇi[1] and Indra have described in very clear words the qualities of true manhood among men and their reproductive power. But as those words are very disgraceful, they are not recorded here. Whoever has any doubt, may refer to the *Bhashya* of Pandit Raja Ram. If there is any person who cannot rest unless and until he calls Heaven a 'Brothel', it is not understood what name he would give to the *Atharva-Veda* after reading what is written there.

91. Leaving these things aside, when every living being has the right to go to Heaven after acquiring necessary merit and Heaven has been inhabited from the very beginning, the presence of women in Heaven should not be considered any extraordinary thing. And if *Yama*, the Lord of that Region, does not remove the semen of those who enter Heaven, then obviously erotic feelings like those of the people of this earth continue to exist among those people also, for the satisfaction of which, association between males females appears to be only quite normal. If viewed impartially, there appears to be no difference between the description given in the *Hindu Śastras*[2] and the Holy Quran. If there really exists some *Loka* or Region where those who perform good actions here on this earth take their birth after death and Providence gives them opportunities to satisfy their heart's desires at that place, it does not make much difference if we call that region '*Svarga*' or we call it '*Bahisht*'.[3] Evidently, the objections advanced in criticism of the '*Bahisht*' of the Holy Quran will literally apply to the '*Svarga*' of the *Vedas*.

As Swami Dayanand believed that the *Vedas* include

---

1. Wife of God Indra. 2. Books of Hindu religion. 3. As a matter of fact, both the words are taken as exact synonyms.

all the sciences and branches of knowledge and also that he had understood the correct meaning of the *Vedas*, he therefore always tried to explain any matter pertaining to science whenever it came up before him. And he never missed any opportunity of criticizing anybody, if he found any mistake in any scientific description given by any person. He has thus criticized many *Ayats* of the Holy Quran, a few examples of which are given hereunder :—

92.

(۱) اللہ آفتاب کو مشرق سے لاتا ہے۔ بس تو مغرب سے لے آ۔ تب وہ کافر حیران رہ گیا۔ تحقیق اللہ گنہگاروں کو راہ نہیں دکھلاتا۔ (سپارہ ۳ - سورۃ البقر۔ آیت ۲۵۴)

محقق—دیکھئے یہ لاعلمی کی بات ہے۔ آفتاب نہ مشرق سے مغرب اور نہ مغرب سے مشرق کبھی آتا جاتا ہے۔ وہ اپنے محور میں گردش کرتا رہتا ہے اس سے تحقیق جانا جاتا ہے کہ قران کے مصنف کو علم ہئیت اور جگرافیہ بھی نہیں آتا تھا۔

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحات ۵۷۹ و ۵۸۰)

(1) Allāh aftāb kō mashriq se lātā hai. Bas tū maghrib se le ā. Tab voh kāfir hairān rah gayā. Tahqīq Allāh gunahgārōn kō rāh nahīn dikhlātā. (Sipara 3. Surat-ul-Baqar, Ayat 254).

Muhaqqiq—Dekhiye yeh lā'ilmī kī bāt hai. Āftāb na mashriq se maghrib aur na maghrib se mashriq kabhī ātā jātā hai. Voh apne mahvar men gardish kartā rahtā hai. Is se tahqīq jānā jātā hai ki Qurān ke musannif kō 'Ilm Haiyat aur Jugrāfiyā bhī nahīn ātā thā.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 579 and 580).

Translation —

God brings up the sun from the east. Thou bring it from the west. Then the infidel got astonished. Assuredly, God does not show the way to the sinful.''

(Sipara 3, Surat-ul-Baqar, Ayat 254).

Critic—Just see, all this is due to ignorance.

The sun neither travels from the east to the west nor does it ever travel from the west to the east. It only rotates round its axis[1]. From this, it follows definitely that the author of the Holy Quran did not possess at all any knowledge of astronomy and geography.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, pp. 579 & 580).

(۲) اتارا ہے اس نے آسمان سے پانی- پس بہے نالے ساتھ اندازے اپنے اپنے کے - (سورۃ رعد)

محقق— ....اور خدا بادلوں کا علم جانتا تو ' آسمان سے پانی اتارا' اسکے ساتھ یہ کیوں نہ لکھا کہ زمین سے پانی اس پر چڑھایا - اس سے تحقیق ہوا کہ قران کا مصنف بادلوں کے علم کو بھی نہیں جانتا تھا -

(ستیارتھ پرکش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۵۹۸)

(2) Utārā hai usne āsmān se pānī, pas bahe nāle sāth andāze apne apne ke............ (Sūrat Ra'ad).

Critic..............Aur Khudā bādlōn kā 'ilm jāntā, tō 'āsmān se pānī utārā' iske sāth yeh kyōn na likhā ke zamīn se pānī us par chaṛhāyā. Is se tahqīq huā ke Qurān kā musannif bādlōn ke 'ilm kō bhī nahīn jāntā thā'."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 597-598)

Translation —

(2) He brought down water from the sky and the rivulets began to flow in their own various ways. (*Surat* Ra'ad).

Critic—And if God had knowledge about the clouds, He should have written along with the words 'water was brought down from the sky', the words 'water was raised up to the sky from the earth.' This definitely shows that the author of the Holy Quran was not acquainted even with the knowledge of the working of the clouds.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 597-598)

---

1. But what relationship has the rotation of the sun round its axis with the rising and the setting of the sun on the earth?

(۳) اور کئے بیچ زمین کے پہاڑ - ایسا نہ ہو کہ ہل جائے -
(سورۃ انبیا)

محقق—اگر مصنف قران زمین کی گردش وغیرہ کو جانتا تو یہ بات کبھی نہ کہتا کہ پہاڑوں کے رکھنے سے زمین نہیں ہلتی- شک ہوا کہ اگر پہاڑ نہ رکھتا تو ہل جاتی - پہاڑ رکھنے پر بھی زلزلہ کے وقت کیوں ہل جاتی ہے ؟
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۶۰۴)

(3) Aur kiye bīch zamīn ke pahāṛ, aisā na hō ke hil jāye.
(Sūrat-ul-Ambiyā).

Critic—Agar musannif Qurān zamīn kī gardish vagairah kō jāntā tō yeh bāt kabhī na kahtā ki pahāṛōn ke rakhne se zamīn nahīn hiltī. Shak huā ki agar pahāṛ na rakhtā tō ḥil jātī. Pahāṛ rakhhne par bhī zalzale ke vaqt kyōn hil jātī hai ?
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 604)

Translation —

And He created mountains across the earth, lest the earth should shake.

Critic—If the author of the Holy Quran had known how the earth revolves, he would never have said that the earth does not shake, because mountains have been placed on it. He perhaps feared that without the mountains the earth might have shaken. But then why does it shake at the time of earth-quakes in spite of mountains being there ?
(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 604)

93. No doubt, the sun does not travel from the east to the west nor from the west to the east. The earth rotates round its axis from the west to the east and the sun appears to the people on the earth to rise in the east and go towards the west. But it is a wrong expression in common use among people that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. And this expression has been used by the whole world every day in conversation since the beginning of the

creation and all people use this expression even now[1]. And even in Sanskrit language the words *'udaya'* and *'asta'* are always used in respect of the sun. The meaning of the word *'udaya'* is 'coming up' or 'rising' and the meaning of the word *'asta'* is 'sitting down' or 'descending'. It is written in Chhāndogya Upanishad :—

स यावदादित्यः पुरस्तादुदेता पश्चादस्तमेता,
वसूनामेव तावदाधिपत्यँ स्वाराज्यं पर्येता ॥

Sa yāvadādityaḥ purastādudetā, paschādastmetā,
Vasūnāmeva tāvadādhipatyam svārājyam paryetā.

Translation —

For so long as the sun takes to rise in the east and set in the west, he obtains the independent Kingdom of the *Vasus*[2]. (Chhāndogya Upanishad Bhāshya by Pt. Raja Ram, Prapāṭhaka 3, Khanda 6, *Śloka* 4)

It is possible that the statement of the Chhandogya Upanishad may not be acceptable. Hence the authority of the Yajur-Veda is also quoted here :—

आ कृष्णेन रजसा वर्तमानो निवेशयन्नमृतं मर्त्यञ्च ।
हिरण्ययेन सविता रथेना देवो याति भुवनानि पश्यन् ॥

"Ā kṛishṇena rajasā vartmānō niveśayannamṛitam martyancha,
Hiraṇyayena Savitā rathenā devō yāti bhuvanāni paśyan."

Translation —

Just as the sun moving about along with the group of planets which attract each other, keeps perishable or mortal living beings and imperishable physical substances in their proper place and also provides light to all the *Lokas* from its luminous form etc. etc., so also...... (Yajur-Veda 33-43).

1. Even Swami Dayanand himself used these words in Satyārtha Prakāśa, 13th Hindi Edition, vide page 241. 2. A class of gods.

This translation is that of Pt. Jaya Deva Sharma. Swami Dayanand has stated in his commentary even more clearly than this that the Sun goes from the east to the west giving light to all the *Lokas*. The words of the commentary are reproduced below:—

"............सब लोकों को दिखाता हुआ प्रकाशमान् सूर्यदेव जल वा अविनाशी आकाशादि और मरणधर्मी प्राणिमात्र को अपने अपने प्रदेश में स्थापित करता हुआ उदयास्त समय में आता जाता है.........इत्यादि (पृष्ठ १०५)

".........Sab lōkōn kō dikhātā huā prakāśamān Sūryadeva jal vā avināśī ākāśādi aur maraṇadharmī prāṇimātra kō apne apne pradeśa men sthāpit kartā huā udayāst samaya men ātā jātā hai........" Ityādi (Pṛishṭh 105)

Translation —

Illumining all the *Lokas*, the luminous Sun, keeping the imperishable *akaśa*, *jala* etc. and the mortal living beings in their own respective places, comes and goes away at the time of its rising and its setting. (Page 105)

94. Similarly, it is not clear how the words "water was brought down from the sky", said to have been spoken of about God, show that God did not have any knowledge about the clouds. Does Swami Dayanand wish to say that water first manifested itself on the earth and from there got up to the sky? He must have been knowing that water is a compound of two gases, hydrogen and oxygen and as the gases are found in the atmosphere, obviously water which is produced by their coming together or mixing must have first come into existence in the atmosphere, i.e. the sky. Of course water vapours rise from the seas and the earth but this is a process which follows and comes later on.

95. Then the question of preventing the earth from shaking by means of the weight of the mountains remains

to be considered. It would have been very good if Swami Dayanand had been living at this time and had become acquainted with the theory of scientists regarding earthquakes. These days the whole world says that there is molten matter under the crust of the earth and the crust of the earth floats on the molten matter and if there were no mountains, there would be earthquakes all the day and night. The weight of the mountains has kept the crust of the earth i.e. the solid portion of the earth in position over the molten matter.

SATSANGI'S OPINIONS BASED ON INVESTIGATION

VIII

CHANGES IN BELIEF

96. Quite a good number of quotations have been given from the Biography of Swami Dayanand and also from his own writings, on the basis of which a Satsangi can express his well-considered opinion. There is no doubt that Swami Dayanand was an eminent person of his time. From his childhood, he had love for *paramartha* and he spent a major portion of his life in religious enquiry and in this connection put up with all kinds of troubles. He went to inaccessible forests and mountains in search of *Yogis* and gained whatever knowledge he could secure from every source. The world offered him many temptations to deflect him from the noble path but he remained steady. He had occasion to stay in hundreds of temples and *maths* or monasteries, but he did not find there anything except hypocrisy and humbug. During his travels to the big cities of India, he found that the Hindu community was entangled in the net spread by ignorant priests and that it had lost both its secular position

as well as its religious objectives. In spite of his most strennuous efforts, he did not come across a *Yogi* who could teach him the practices of real *Yoga*. Yearning for service of the country and thus compelled, he took shelter under Swami Virajanand and then decided that the fraud practised by the hypocritical *Brahmans* must be removed and true Vedic Religion propagated in India once again. Indians had had no occasion so far to listen to criticism of idol-worship and the *Puranas* from a Sanskrit-knowing Sanyasi. Therefore as soon as Swami Dayanand began to propagate his principles, there was a great stir in every part of the country. There were many debates and many big *Pandits* had to bow before him. The *Vedas* were not easily available in the country in those days. *Pandits* generally contented themselves with the study of the *Puranas* and Sanskrit grammar and only a few lovers of knowledge paid any attention to the study of the *Upanishads* and the six systems of Indian Philosophy and even eminent *Pandits* had had no occasion to see the *Vedas*. As against this, Swami Dayanand took up the position that he accepted the *Vedas* as authoritative in themselves and all the other *Śastras* as only secondary authority. When it was not possible for the *Pandits* even to have a look at the *Vedas*, how could they give any proofs from the *Vedas* in support of their contention? In short, for a long time, there were defeats and victories during discussions and the result was that the Hindu community, which was steeped in deep ignorance, at last woke up and its attention was drawn to the study of the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*. It is due to the efforts of Swami Dayanand that every individual today has an opportunity to see the *Vedas* and other Hindu *Śastras* by spending a few rupees and to study them with the help of commentaries and glossaries which are in Hindi and to become acquainted with the subtle truths discovered by venerable Sages of ancient times. And it can also be stated without any fear of contradiction that the enthusiasm at present found in the Hindu community for investigation

in religious matters is the result of the untiring efforts of Swami Dayanand. Formerly the general practice was that the son of a *Śaiva*[1] became a *Śaiva* and the the son of a *Vaishnava*,[2] a *Vaishnava* and thus people spent their whole life in worshipping the Deity of the family and they never thought at all about their personal responsibility in the matter till even the last day.

97. Every intelligent person knows that when any reformer raises his voice of protest against the defects engrained deep in the members of any community or country and tries to remove them, he has to face great obstacles and difficulties. Thus Swami Dayanand also had to face such obstacles and difficulties. As long as he asked the *Pandits* for authority of the *Vedas* in support of their arguments, it was an easy matter but when the *Pandits* in return began asking him to quote the authority of the *Vedas* and placed before him the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and other *Acharyas*[3] in connection with the interpretation of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* and also referred by way of help to *Śatapatha* and *Aitereya Brahmanas*, Swami Dayanand found himself in great difficulty because Sāyaṇa and other *Acharyas* had interpreted the *mantras* of the *Vedas* so as to permit the worship of gods and also in consonance with the fact that in the *Śatapatha* and other *Brahmanas* worship of gods and sacrifice of animals had been prescribed. Thus compelled, Swami Dayanand started writing his *Bhashya* of the *Vedas* but it was not an easy matter. If the *Vedas* are books really containing divine knowledge, obviously knowledge of grammar and dictionaries alone cannot be sufficient to enable one to understand their meaning correctly and to express it. Briefly stated, he thus had therefore three great responsibilities; first, to produce a new commentary on the *Vedas* for establishing the truth of the principles preached by him and to

---

1. Follower of Śaivism, for which see Note 2 on page 113.
2. Follower of Vaishnavism, for which see Note 1 on page 113.
3. Learned scholars.

show that those principles represented the true Vedic religion; secondly, to criticize all the other religions of India in order to establish the superiority of Vedic religion; and thirdly, to prove that the statements contained in the books of ancient *Rishis* and *Maharshis*[1] were in full accord with the *Vedas* and corroborated the principles preached by him. History supports the view that he tried to carry out all this work with great courage and strength of will, but because he had not attained self-realization nor was he an incarnation but was only a scholar of grammar and a patriot, naturally therefore his beliefs underwent change at different times and as he was unacquainted with the methods of research in the light of the present times, his arguments were often weak and incoherent. Thus, because his inner eye had not opened, he was devoid of true knowledge and was in a helpless condition and because he felt compelled to take a definite attitude on account of his ideals and on account of his belief in the superiority of the Vedic Religion, and also because he was determined not to look at other religions except from a particular angle, he was unable to form correct and proper opinions about those religions and founders and leaders of those religions. In part I of this book, we have already dealt with the useless and misleading arguments that he advanced in support of his theory of "Return from Salvation" and in the preceding pages of this book we have dealt with his incorrect researches in sufficient detail. It does not therefore appear necessary to repeat them here again.

IX

REGARDING ŚAIVISM

98. The Arya Samaj celebrates with great eclat the

1. Mahā (Great) Rishi is Maharshi. For Rishi, see Note 1 on page 10.

festival of *Rishibodh*[1] in memory of Swami Dayanand on the occasion of *Śiva Ratri*[2]. It is stated in the biography of Swami Dayanand that his family followed the *Śaiva* religion. In 1837 when he was 14 years of age he was, under instructions of his father, keeping vigil on the night of *Śiva-Ratri* with other devotees in a *Śiva* temple in Morvi. After mid-night, everybody else was in deep sleep but even though he was too young, Swami Dayanand remained wide awake. Then he saw a strange sight that a rat came running and ascended to the top of the idol of Lord Śiva. Observing the rat going this side and that and eating the things offered to Lord Śiva, Swami Dayanand wondered how it could be God's idol when He could not even ward off a mere rat. He awakened his respected father and told him what was passing in his mind. His father tried to explain things to him as best he could but the latter was not satisfied. It was thus that his mind turned away from idol-worship for ever and he thought of securing clear *darśana* of real Śiva. The festival of *Rishibodh* is celebrated in commemoration of this event. Swami Dayanand himself and the writers of his biography also have attached very great importance to this incident, because it is considered to be the turning point of his life. The writer of the Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand writes on page 41 :—

آنریبل سر سید احمد خاں صاحب نے سوامی جی کے اس موقع
کی بابت لکھا ہے کہ اگر الہام نہیں تھا تو کیا تھا جس نے سوامی
دیانند سرسوتی کے دل کو مورتي پوجا سے پھیرا -

"Hon'ble Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan Sahab ne Swamiji ke is mauqe kī bābat likhā hai ki agar ilhām nahīn thā tō kyā thā jisne Swami Dayanand Saraswati ke dil kō mūrtipūjā se pherā ?"

---

1. The festival is known as 'Rishibodh' because Swami Dayanand felt the inner urge against old beliefs in idol-worship etc. 2. A Hindu festival of fasting by the devotees of Lord Śiva. It generally falls in the month of February or March.

Translation—

Hon'ble Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan[1] has written about this incident of the life of Swami Dayanand that "if this incident which turned Swami Dayanand's mind away from idol-worship is not an inspiration from God, what else was it ?"

In view of all these circumstances, every individual will naturally expect that after this incident or divine inspiration, Swamiji's mind could never have turned to idol-worship or *Śaivism* but our surprise knew no bounds when we read in his autobiography (on page 46) that Swami Dayanand, after about 30 years of this incident criticized the *Vaishnava* faith and publicly declared *Śaivism* as the only correct faith. The following are the original words :—

جےپور میں ھریشچندر ایک ودوان پنڈت تھا - وھاں میں
نے پرتھم ویشنو مت کا کھنڈن کرکے شیو مت کی ستھاپنا کی -
جےپور کے مہاراج رامسنگھ نے بھی شیو مت گرھن کیا - اس سے
شیو مت کا اتنا وستار ھوا کہ سہسروں رڈراکش مالا میں نے اپنے
ھاتھ سے دیں - شیو مت اتنا ڈرڑھ ھوا کہ ھاتھی گھوڑے
آدی سب کے گلے میں رڈراکش کی مالا پڑ گئی -

"Jaipur men Harish Chandra ek vidvān paṇḍit thā. Vahān main ne pratham Vaishnava mat kā khanḍan karke Śaiva mat kī sthāpanā kī. Jaipur ke Mahārāj Ram Singh ne bhī Śaiva mat grahaṇa kiyā. Is se Śaiva mat kā itnā vistār huā ki sahasrōn rudrāksh mālā main ne apne hāth se deen. Vahān Śaiva mat itnā dṛidh huā ki hāthī ghōṛe ādi sab ke gale men rudrāksh kī mālā paṛ gayee.

Translation —

There was a learned Pandit at Jaipur, Harish Chandra by name. There I first criticized *Vaishnava* faith and then propagated *Śaivism*. Maharaja Ram Singh of Jaipur also accepted *Śaivism*. The result was that

1. A Muslim leader of India. He did a lot for the education of his community.

Śaivism became so popular that thousands of *Rudraksh* rosaries were distributed by me personally and *Śaivism* was established so firmly that *Rudraksh* rosaries were found round the necks of elephants, horses etc.

It should be remembered that this incident took place after Swami Dayanand had finished his studies under Swami Virajanand and had undertaken to remove the ignorance of different religions and to propagate the Vedic religion.

Swami Dayanand proceeded from Jaipur to Ajmer and there his beliefs changed again and he criticized *Śaivism* also at that place.

X

REGARDING MEAT-EATING

99. It is written on pages 301 and 302 of the 1st edition of Satyārtha Prakāśa that meat can be taken after being offered at sacrifices and on page 42 of 'Samskāra Vidhi' written by Swami Dayanand and published in 1877, he has permitted partridge soup being given to children at the time of *Annapraśana* ceremony[1]. Rai Bahadur Mool Raj, M. A., Retd. District Judge and the first President of the Lahore Arya Samaj and Vice President of the Paropakāriṇī Sabha Ajmer writes on page 6 of the pamphlet "Daś Praśnī kī Ishāyat kī asal Haqīqat"[2]

منشی سمرتھداان نے ستمبر ۱۸۹۱ع میں ستیارتھ پرکاش کے
دوسرے ایڈیشن کے مسودہ کو مجھے دکھایا تھا جسکے حاشیہ پر

1. A ceremony religiously observed when solid diet is given to a new-born child for the first time. 2. This is the long name of the pamphlet. It means—"The real reason for the publication of the pamphlet 'Daśa Praśṇī'. 'Daśa Praśṇī' (Ten questions) is a pamphlet written by 'Ārya Samāj kā ek Purānā Sevak'.

سوامی جی نے اپنے دستخطوں سے مانس کے حق میں کچھ سطریں لکھی تھیں - بعد ازاں اُسی مہینے میں میں اُدےپور گیا اور پروپکارنی سبھا کے منتری پنڈت موہن‌لال وشنولال پانڈیا کے پاس ٹھہرا - شری سوامی دیانند سرسوتی کے پتربیوہار کو دکھانے کے لئے اُن سے کہا - اُنہوں نے ایک صندوق میرے سپرد کیا جس میں سے ایک خط منشی سمرتھ دان کا ملا - جس میں منشی جی نے سوامی جی کو لکھا تھا کہ میں مانس کے حق میں لکھی ہوئی سطروں کو ستیارتھ پرکاش میں شایع کرنا قرین مصلحت نہیں سمجھتا -

"Munshī Samarthdān ne Sitamber 1891 men Satyārtha Prakāśa ke dūsre edition ke masōde kō mujhe dikhāyā thā jiske hāshiye par Swamiji ne apne dastkhatōn se māns ke haq men kuchch satren likhī thīn. Bād azān usī mahīne men main Udaipur gayā aur Paropakāriṇī Sabhā ke Mantrī Mohan Lal Vishṇu Lal Pandya ke pās thehrā. Shri Swami Dayanand Saraswati ke patra-vyavahār kō dikhāne ke liye unse kahā. Unhōn ne ek sandūq mere sapurd kiyā jismen se ek khat Munshī Samarthdān kā milā jismen Munshi ji ne Swami ji kō likhā thā ki main māns ke haq men likhī huyee satarōn kō Satyārtha Prakāśa men shāyā karnā qarīn maslihat nahīn samajhtā".

Translation —

In 1891, Munshi Samarthdan showed to me a manuscript for the 2nd edition of the Satyārtha Prakaśa on the margin of which Swami Dayanand had written some lines in his own handwriting in favour of taking meat. Thereafter I went to Udaipur in the same month and stayed with Pandit Mohan Lal Vishnu Lal Pandya, Secretary of the Paropakāriṇī Sabha and asked him to show me the correspondence he had with Swami Dayanand Saraswati. He placed at my disposal a box in which I found a letter of Munshi Samarthdan in which Munshi Samarthdan had written to Swami Dayanand that he did not consider it advisable to publish in the Satyārtha Prakāśa those lines which were in favour of meat-eating.

From this statement and what has been written before, it is established that Swami Dayanand was not opposed to meat-eating upto 1877 but from an unpublished letter of his, which has recently been published by a research scholar of Lahore, it appears that later on Swami Dayanand became antagonistic to the killing of living beings. The original letter runs :—

यवन मत (दीने इस्लाम) ईसाई धर्म का पुत्र और ईसाई धर्म बौद्ध धर्म का पुत्र है, और बौद्ध धर्म वेद की उस क्रूरता (वैदकी हिंसा हिंसा न भवति) का जो यज्ञ तथा वेद के नाम से निरपराध पशुओं पर की जाती थी आदर्श विरोध है।

"Yavan mat (Din-e-Islām) Īsāī dharma kā putra aur Īsāī dharma Baudh dharma kā putra hai. Aur Baudh dharma Veda kī us krūratā (Vaidikī himsā himsā na bhavati) kā, jō yajña tathā Veda ke nām se niraparādh pashuōn par kī jatī thī ādarśa virōdh hai."

Translation —

Islam is the child of Christianity and Christianity that of Buddhism and Buddhism is entirely opposed to that cruelty which is signified by the phrase 'वैदिकी हिंसा हिंसा न भवति' (Vaidikī himsā himsā na bhavati)[1] and which was meted out to innocent animals in the name of sacrifices and in the name of the *Vedas*.

In other words Swami Dayanand thus considered sacrifice of animals even in *yajnas* as improper. The readers would perhaps like to read the original statement in the first edition of the Satyārtha Prakāsa because this book is not easily available now and it clearly states the original principles of Swami Dayanand. It is therefore reproduced below :—

1. The phrase means :—
Violence or killing done in connection with Vedic ceremonies and rituals cannot be said to be violence or killing.

और भक्ष्य अभक्ष्य दो प्रकार के होते हैं। एक तो वैद्यक शास्त्र की रीति से और दूसरा धर्म शास्त्र की रीति से। सो वैद्यक शास्त्र की रीति से देश, काल, वस्तु और अपने शरीर की प्रकृति उनसे अनुकूल विचार करके भक्षण करना चाहिए अन्यथा नहीं। जिससे बल, बुद्धि, पराक्रम और शरीर में नैरोग्य बढ़े वैसा पदार्थ भक्ष्य है। सोई उक्त वैद्यक सुश्रुत शास्त्र में लिखा है। और 'अभक्ष्यो ग्राम्य शूकरोऽभक्ष्यो ग्राम्य कुक्कुटः' इत्यादिक धर्म शास्त्र से अभक्ष्य का निर्णय करना क्योंकि सूअर गाँव का और मुर्ग़ा प्रायः मल ही खाता है उसी का परिणाम मांस होगा। उसके खाने से दुर्गन्ध शरीर में होगा। उससे रोगोत्पत्ति का सम्भव है और चित्त भी अप्रसन्न हो जायगा। वैसा ही धर्म शास्त्र की रीति से मद्य अभक्ष्य तथा जितने मनुष्यों के उपकारक पशु उनका मांस अभक्ष्य तथा बिना होम से अन्न और माँस भी अभक्ष्य है। (प्रश्न) एक जीव को मार के अग्नि में जलाना और फिर खाना यह कुछ अच्छी बात नहीं और जीव को पीड़ा देना किसी को अच्छा नहीं। (उत्तर) इसमें क्या कुछ पाप होता है? (प्रश्न) पाप ही होता है क्योंकि जीवों को पीड़ा देके अपना पेट भरना यह धर्मात्माओं की रीति नहीं। (उत्तर) अच्छा एक जीव को मारने में पीड़ा होती है सो सब व्यवहारों को छोड़ देना चाहिए। क्योंकि नेत्र की चेष्टा से भी सूक्ष्म देह वाले जीवों को पीड़ा अवश्य होती है। और तुम्हारे घर में कोई मनुष्य चोरी करे तो तुम लोग भी अवश्य उसको पीड़ा देओगे और मक्खी आदिक भोजन के ऊपर से उड़ा देते हो इसमें भी उसको पीड़ा होती है। और जो कुछ तुम खाते पीते, चलते फिरते और बैठते हो इस व्यवहार से भी बहुत जीवों को पीड़ा होती है। इससे तुम्हारा कहना व्यर्थ है कि किसी जीव को पीड़ा न देना। (प्रश्न) जिसमें प्रत्यक्ष पीड़ा होती है हम लोग उसमें पाप गिनते हैं। अप्रत्यक्ष में कभी नहीं क्योंकि अप्रत्यक्ष में पाप गिनें तो हमारा व्यवहार न बने। (उत्तर) ऐसे ही आप लोग जानें कि जहाँ अपना अपना मतलब होय वहाँ तो पाप नहीं गिनते हो, यह बात युक्ति से विरुद्ध है। और कोई भी माँस न खाय तो जानवर, पक्षी, मत्स्य और जलजन्तु इतने हैं कि उनसे शत सहस्र गुने हो जायँ फिर मनुष्यों को मारने लगें और खेतों में धान्य ही न होने पावे। फिर सब मनुष्यों की आजीविका नष्ट होने से सब

मनुष्य नष्ट हो जायँ। और व्याघ्र आदिक मांसाहारी जीव भी उन मृगादिकों का भक्षण करते हैं, और गाय आदिकों को भी। परन्तु मनुष्य लोगों को यह चाहिए कि गाय, बैल, भैंसी, छेड़ी, भेड़ और ऊँट आदिक पशुओं को कभी न मारें क्योंकि इन्हीं से सब मनुष्यों की आजीविका चलती है। जितने दुग्ध आदिक पदार्थ होते हैं वे सब उत्तम ही होते हैं और एक पशु से बहुत आजीविका मनुष्यों की होती है। मारने से जहाँ सौ मनुष्य तृप्त होते हैं उस गाय आदिक पशुओं के बीच में से एक गाय की रक्षा से दस हजार मनुष्यों की रक्षा हो सकती है। इससे इन पशुओं को कभी न मारना चाहिए। (प्रश्न) इन पशुओं के नहीं मारने से इनके बहुत होने से सब पृथ्वी भर जायगी फिर भी तो मनुष्यों को हानि होने लगेगी। (उत्तर) ऐसा न कहना चाहिए क्योंकि व्याघ्र आदिक जीव उनको मारेंगे और कितने रोगों से भी मरेंगे। इससे अत्यन्त नहीं होने पावेंगे और मष्नुयों के मारने से घृतादिक पदार्थ और पशुओं को उत्पत्ति भी नष्ट हो जाती है। इससे जहाँ जहाँ गोमेधादिक लिखे हैं वहाँ वहाँ पशुओं में नरों का मारना लिखा है। इससे इस अभिप्राय से नरमेध लिखा है। मनुष्य नर को मारना कहीं नहीं। क्योंकि जैसी पुष्टि बैलादिक नरों में है वैसी स्त्रियों में नहीं है। और एक बैल से हजारहा गैया गर्भवती होती हैं। इससे हानि भी नहीं होती। सोई लिखा है :—

"गौरनुबन्ध्योऽग्नीषोमीयः"

यह ब्राह्मण की श्रुति है। इसमें पुल्लिङ्ग निर्देश से यह जाना जाता है कि बैल आदिक को मारना, गैया को नहीं; सो भी गोमेधादिक यज्ञों में, अन्यत्र नहीं; क्योंकि बैल आदि से भी मनुष्यों का बहुत उपकार होता है; इससे इनकी भी रक्षा करनी चाहिए। और जो वंध्या गाय होती है उसका भी गोमेध में मारना लिखा है।

'स्थूल पृषतीमाग्ने वारुणी मनड्वाहीमालभेत्।'

यह ब्राह्मण की श्रुति है। इसमें स्त्रीलिंग और स्थूल पृषती विशेषण से वन्ध्या गाय ली जाती है क्योंकि वन्ध्या से दुग्ध और वत्सादिकों की उत्पत्ति होती नहीं और जो माँस न खाय तो घृत दुग्धादिकों से निर्वाह करे, क्योंकि घृत, दुग्ध आदिकों में भी बहुत पुष्टि होती है,

सो जो माँस खाय अथवा घृत आदिकों से निर्वाह करे वे भी सब अग्नि में होम के बिना न खायँ।" (सत्यार्थ प्रकाश, प्रथम संस्करण पृष्ठ २०१-२०३)

"Aur bhakshya abhakshya dō prakār ke hōte hain. Ek tō Vedic Śāstra kī rīti se aur dūsre Dharma Śāstra kī rīti se. Sō Vedic Śāstra kī rīti se deśa, kāl, vastu aur apne śarīr kī prakṛiti unse anukūl vichār karke bhakshaṇa karṇā chāhiye, anyathā nahīn. Jis se bal, buddhi, parākram aur śarīr men nairōgya baṛhe vaisā padārath bhakshya hai. Sōyee ukta Vedic Suśrut Śāstra men likhā hai, aur 'Abhakshyō grāmyasūkarō abhakshyō gramyakukkuṭah' ityādik Dharma Śāstra se abhakshya kā nirṇaya karnā, kyōnki sūar gāōn kā aur murghā prāyah mal hī khātā hai, usī kā pariṇāma māns hōgā. Uske khāne se durgandh śarīr men hōgā. Us se rōgōtpatti kā sambhav hai aur chitt bhī aprasann hō jāegā. Vaisā hī Dharma Śāstra kī rīti se madya abhakshya tathā jitne manushyōn ke upakārak paśu unkā māns abhakshya tathā binā hōma se anna aur māns bhī abhakshya hai. (Praśna)—Ek jīva kō mār ke agni men jalānā aur phir khānā yeh kuchh achchhī bāt nahīn aur jīva kō pīṛā denā kisī kō achchhā nahīn. (Uttar) Is men kyā kuchh pāp hōtā hai? (Praśna)—Pāp hī hōtā hai kyōnki jīvōn kō pīṛā deke apnā peṭ bharnā yeh dharmātmāōn kī rīti nahīn. (Uttar) Achchhā ek jīva kō mārne men pīṛā hōtī hai sō sab vyavahārōn kō chhōṛ denā chāhiye. Kyōnki netra kī cheshṭā se bhī sūkshma deh wāle jīvōn kō pīrā avaśya hōtī hai. Aur tumhāre ghar men kōī manushya chōrī kare tō tum lōg bhī avaśya uskō pīṛā deōge aur makkhī ādik bhōjan ke ūpar se uṛā dete hō us men bhī uskō pīṛā hōtī hai. Aur jō kuchh tum khāte pīte, chalte phirte aur baiṭhte hō is vyavahār se bhī bahut jīvōn kō pīṛā hōtī hai. Is se tumhārā kahnā vyarth hai ki kisī jīva kō pīṛā na denā. (Praśna) Jismen pratyaksh pīṛā hōtī hai ham lōg usmen pāp ginte hain. Apratyaksh men kabhī nahīn, kyōnki apratyaksh men pāp ginen tō hamārā vyavahār na bane. (Uttar) Aise hī āp lōg jānen ki jahān apnā apnā matlab hōye vahān tō pāp nahīn ginte hō, yeh bāt yukti se viruddh hai. Aur kōī bhī māns na khāye tō jānwar, pakshī, matsya aur jaljantu itne hain ki unse śata sahasra gune hō jāyen; phir manushyōn kō mārne lagen aur khetōn men dhānya hī na hōne pāve. Phir sab manushyōn kī ājīvika nashṭ hōne se sab manushya nashṭ hō jāyen aur vyāghra ādik mānsāhārī jīva bhī un mrigādikōn kā bhakshṇa karte hain, aur gāye, ādikōn kō bhī. Parantu manushya lōgōn kō yeh chāhiye ki gāye, bail, bhainsī, chherī, bheṛ aur ūnt ādik paśuōn kō kabhī na māren kyōnki inhīn se sab manushyōn kī ajīvikā

chaltī hai. Jitne dugdh ādik padārath hōte hain ve sab uttam hī hōte hain aur ek paśu se bahut ājīvikā manushyōn kī hōtī hai. Mārne se jahān sau manushya tripta hōte hain us gāye ādik pasuōn ke bīch men se ek gāye kī rakshā se das hazār manushyōn kī rakshā hō saktī hai. Is se in pasuōn kō kabhī na mārnā chāhiye. (Praśna) In pasuōn ke nahīn mārne se inke bahut hōne se sab pṛithvī bhar jāegī phir bhī tō manushyōn kō hāni hōne lagegī. (Uttar) Aisā na kahnā chāhiye kyōnki vyāghra ādik jīva unkō mārenge aur kitne rōgōn se bhī marenge. Is se atyant nahīn hōne pāvenge aur manushōyn ke mārne se ghṛitādik padārth aur pasuōn kī utpatti bhī nashṭ hō jātī hai. Is se jahān jahān gōmedhādik likhe hain vahān vahān paśuōn men naron kā mārnā likhā hai. Is se is abhiprāya se narmedh likhā hai, manushya nar ko mārnā kahīn nahīn. Kyonki jaisī pushṭi bail-ādik naron men hai vaisī striyōn men nahīn hai. Aur ek bail se hazārhā gāye garbhvatī hōtī hain. Is se hāni bhī nahīn hotī. Soī likhā hai :—

गौस्नुबन्ध्योऽग्नीषोमीयः । 'Gaurnubandhyō agnīshōmīyaḥ',

yeh Brāhmaṇa kī śruti hai. Is men pul-ling nirdeś se yeh jānā jātā hai ki bail ādik kō mārnā, gāye kō nahīn, sō bhī Gōmedh-ādik yagyōn men, anyetar nahīn, kyōnki bail ādi se bhī manushyōn kā bahūt upkār hōtā hai; is se inkī bhī rakshā karnī chāhiye, aur jō bandhya gāye hōtī hai uskā bhī gōmedh men mārnā likhā hai :—

'स्थूलपृषतीमाग्नेवारुणी मण्ड्वाहीमालमेत्' ।

'Sthūlapṛishatīmāgne vāruṇī manḍvāhīmālabhet',

Yah Brāhmaṇa kī Śruti hai. Is men strī-ling aur sthūla pṛishatī viśeshaṇa se vandhya gāye lī jātī hai. Kyōnki vandhyā se dugdh aur vatsādikōn kī utpatti hōtī nahīn aur jō māns na khāye sō ghṛit, dugdhādikōn se nirbāh kare kyonki ghrita-dugdhādikōn men bhī bahut pushṭi hōtī hai, sō jō māns khāye athavā ghṛit ādikōn se nirvāh kare, ve bhī sab agni men hōma ke binā na khāyen." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 1st. Edition Pp. 301-303)

Translation —

The भक्ष्य-*bhakshya* (i.e. things fit for eating) and अभक्ष्य-*abhakshya* (i.e. things unfit for eating) are classified in two ways :—(1) according to the Medical Science and (2), according to religion. Thus according to Medical Science, man should eat what is suitable with reference to place, time, thing eaten and one's own temperament and not otherwise, i.e. things which

increase strength, intellect, valour and health should be considered as *bhakshya*. It is so stated in *Suśruta*, a book of Medical Science. And according to religion one should decide about what is unfit for eating in accordance with the rule as below :—

अभक्ष्यो ग्राम्य शूकरोऽभक्ष्यो ग्राम्य कुक्कुटः

(Abhakshyō grāmya śūkarō abhakshyō grāmya kukkuṭaḥ),

i.e. the village pig is unsuitable for eating and the village cock is also unsuitable, because the village pig and the cock eat filth and the meat of these two would be the product of what they eat and therefore would cause wind. There is possibility of disease appearing as a result and on eating this meat one feels unhappy. Similarly, according to religion wine should not be taken and so also the meat of all those animals which are useful to man is non-eatable and food and meat without performing *Homa* or *Yajna* are also non-eatable i.e. abhakshya.

(Question) It is not good to kill and roast an animal in fire and then eat it. One also does not like to give pain to any animal.

(Answer) Does this constitute a sin in any way ?

(Question) It is certainly sinful because the virtuous people do not satisfy their hunger by giving pain to animals.

(Answer) Well, if pain is caused to an animal when it is killed, we must give up all activities of our life, for even by mere winking of our eyes, living beings of microscopic size are put to pain and if somebody commits a theft in your house, you would undoubtedly cause pain to him also and when you ward off the flies from your food you cause pain to them and when you eat, drink, move about or sit, many living beings are put to trouble by these activities of yours. This would show that your statement that one should not cause pain to any living being is futile.

(Question) We consider that activity to be a sin which causes pain to others directly and not so that activity which causes pain indirectly. If activities causing pain indirectly are also taken as sin, we cannot carry on in life.

(Answer) This means that you do not consider those activities as sinful which serve your ends. This is obviously against reason and if nobody would take meat, then animals, birds, fish and marine animals would increase hundred thousand times and would begin to kill men and crops may not prosper in fields and when man's livelihood is destroyed, all men will be destroyed. Tigers etc. and other carnivorous animals eat deer etc. and also cows etc. and it behoves men never to kill cows, bullocks she-buffalow, goats, sheep, camels etc. for man gets his livelihood with the help of these animals. Things like milk etc. are very good for men and even one single animal provides food to many men. If by killing one animal, hunger of a hundred people can be satisfied, ten thousand men can be saved if only a single cow from amongst many is saved from slaughter. Therefore these animals should never be killed. (Question) If these animals are not killed, they would increase in numbers and the whole world would be filled with them. Men would then suffer considerable harm. (Answer) You should not say so, for tigers and other beasts would kill them and many of them would die of disease also and therefore their number can never be too large. But if men begin to kill them, production of ghee and other articles and also the birth of animals would come to an end. Therefore, wherever there is a mention in the *Śastras* of sacrifices like *Gomedh*[1] etc. it refers to the killing of male animals only. It is in this sense that there is

1. Cow-sacrifice.

mention of *Narmedha*[1]. It does not mean killing of male persons. The strength that male animals like bulls etc. possess is not possessed by female animals and even a single bull can impregnate thousands of cows and no harm is done to anybody either. It is thus written गौरनुबन्ध्योऽग्नीषोमीयः "Gauranubandhyo gnīshomīyah". This is a quotation from the *Brahmanas*. The gender indicated in this quotation is masculine and it thus refers to the killing of bulls, bullocks etc. and not cows and only as far as sacrifices known as *Gomedh* etc. are concerned and not otherwise, for even bullocks do much good to men and therefore they too have to be protected. And those cows which are sterile are also permitted to be slaughtered in a *Gomedh*"

स्थूल पृषतीमाग्नेवारुणीमंड्वाहीमालभेत् "Sthūl pṛishatīmā-gnevāruṇīmanḍvāhīmālabhet".

This also is a quotation from the *Brahmanas*. In this quotation the female gender and the word *Sthul Prishati* refer to a sterile cow because a sterile cow produces neither milk nor does it calve etc. and thus he who does not take meat can live on ghee, milk etc. because ghee, milk etc. also give strength. However, all of those who take meat and those who live on ghee etc. should not eat without making oblations to fire.

Evidently thus, according to the *Vedas*, there is permission for taking meat of sterile cows, bullocks and other male animals after one has offered them as oblations.

Swami Dayanand is opposed only to the taking of the meat of female animals and of animals that eat filth but considers the taking of meat of all other animals permissible provided it is taken after making oblations.

---

1. Human sacrifice or sacrifice of male.

100. It is stated on page 26 of the autobiography of Swami Dayanand that in April 1855, Swami Dayanand had occasion to go to Tehri (Garhwal). There a Brahman invited him to dinner one day. When Swami Dayanand went to his place, he turned back from there on seeing meat being cooked there. The host said that meat etc. and other good articles of diet were being prepared only for him. The conversation that ensued after this is reproduced below in the words of Swami Dayanand himself :—

मैंने उससे स्पष्ट कह दिया कि यह सब वृथा और निष्फल हैं और आप मांसभक्षी हैं। मेरे योग्य तो केवल फल आदि हैं। मांस खाना तो दूर रहा, मुझे तो उसके देखने से ही रोग हो जाता है।

Main ne us se spashṭ keh diyā ki yeh sab vṛithā aur nishphal hain aur āp māns-bhakshī hain. Mere yōgya tō keval phal ādi hain. Māns khānā tō dūr rahā, mujhe tō uske dekhne se hī rōg hō jātā hai."

Translation—

I told him plainly that all that he said was meaningless and without purpose, because he himself was a meat-eater. The only things suitable for me were fruits etc. The mere sight of meat sickened me, what to say of eating it !

Further on, it is stated on page 37 of the same book that after a few days when Swami Dayanand left Karunasagar and reached the banks of the Ganges on the other side of Garhmukteshwar via Moradabad and Sambhal, he operated upon a dead body with his own hands and with the help of only a knife merely to examine the correctness of the statements made in the books of *Yoga*. The original words are given below :—

एक दिन देवसंयोग से एक शव मुझे नदी में बहता हुआ मिला। तब समुचित अवसर प्राप्त हुआ कि मैं उसकी परीक्षा करता.........
मैं ने तीक्ष्ण चाकू से जैसा हो सका उसे यथायोग्य काटना प्रारंभ

किया और हृदय को उसमें से निकाल लिया। ऐसे ही शिर और ग्रीवा के अंगों को काट कर सामने रक्खा। इत्यादि

Ek din Deva-sanyōg se ek śava mujhe nadī men bahtā huā milā. Tab samuchit avsar prāpt huā ki main uskī parīkshā kartā. ....Main ne tīkshṇa chākū se jaisā hō sakā use yathāyōgya kāṭnā prārambh kiyā aur hṛidaya kō usmen se nikāl liyā...........aise hī śir aur grīvā ke angōn kō kāṭkar sāmne rakkhā", ityādi.

Translation —

One day accidently I saw a dead body floating in the river. Then I got a suitable opportunity for examining it. With a sharp knife I began to cut it as well as I could and I took out the heart from inside the corpse, ...similarly, I cut out the parts of the head and the neck and placed them before me etc. etc."

It is strange that there was a time when he felt sick merely at the sight of the meat of animals and later on he could operate upon and cut through the dead body of a man and did not feel even slightly unhappy while doing so, what to say of his becoming sick.

X

REGARDING ŚRĀDDHAS, ETC.

It is stated on page 54 of the First Edition of Satyārtha Prakāśa that Preceptors should teach their disciples, never to give up '*Devakarya*', i.e. '*Agnihotra*' etc. and '*Pitrikarya*', i.e. Śrāddhas', (*Tarpana*') etc. And it is written on pages 47 and 48:—

तर्पण और श्राद्ध में क्या फल होगा इसका यह समाधान है कि ....तर्पण किसका नाम है कि तृप्ति का और श्राद्ध किसका

नाम है जो श्रद्धा से किया जाता है। मरे भये पित्रादिकों का तर्पण और श्राद्ध करता है उससे क्या आता है कि जीते भये को अन्न जलादिकों से सेवा अवश्य करनी चाहिये यह जाना गया। दूसरा गुण जिनके ऊपर प्रीति है उनका नाम लेके तर्पण और श्राद्ध करेगा तब उसके चित्त में ज्ञान का संभव है कि जैसे वे मर गये वैसे मुझे भी मरना है। मरण के स्मरण से अधर्म करने में भय होगा, धर्म करने में प्रीति होगी। तीसरा गुण यह है कि दायभाग बाँटने में सन्देह न होगा क्योंकि इसका यह पिता है इसका यह पितामह है है इसका यह प्रपितामह है ऐसे ही छः पीढ़ी तक सभों का नाम कण्ठस्थ रहेगा।............चौथा गुण यह है कि विद्वानों का श्रेष्ठ धर्मात्माओं ही को निमंत्रण भोजन दान देना चाहिये, मूर्खों को कभी नहीं। इससे क्या आता है कि विद्वान् लोग आजीविका के बिना कभी दुःखी न होंगे। निश्चिन्त हो के सब शास्त्रों को पढ़ावेंगे और विचारेंगे, सत्य सत्य उपदेश करेंगे और मूर्खों को भी विद्या पढ़ने में और गुण ग्रहण में प्रीति होगी।

"Tarpaṇa aur Śrāddha men kyā phal hōgā iskā yeh samādhān hai ke............tarpaṇa kiskā nām hai ki tṛipti kā aur 'śrāddha' kiskā nām hai, jō śraddhā se kiyā jātā hai. Mare bhaye pitṛi ādikōn kā tarpaṇa aur śrāddha kartā hai use se kyā ātā hai ke jīte bhaye kō ann aur jal ādikōn se sevā avaśya karnī chāhiye, yeh jānā gayā. Dūsrā guṇ jinke ūpar prīti hai unkā nām leke tarpaṇa aur śrāddha karegā tab uske chitt men jnāna kā sambhav hai ke jaise ve mar gaye vaise mujhkō bhī marnā hai. Maraṇ ke smaraṇa se adharma karne men bhāya hōgā, dharma karne men prīti hōgī. Tīsrā guṇ yeh hai ke dayābhāg bānṭane men sandeh na hōgā kyōnki iskā yeh pitā hai, iskā yeh pitāmah hai, iskā yeh prapitāmah hai, aise hī 6 pīḍhī tak sabhōn kā nām kanṭhastha rahegā...........Chauthā guṇ yeh hai ke vidvānōn kā sreshṭha dharmātmāōn hī kō nimantraṇa bhōjan dān denā chāhiye, mūrkhōn kō kabhī nahīn. Is se kyā ātā hai ke vidvān lōg ājīvikā ke binā kabhī dukhī na hōnge. Nishchint hōke sab Śāstrōn kō paṛhāvenge aur vichārenge. Satya satya updeśa karenge aur mūrkhōn kā apmān hōne se mūrkhōn kō bhī vidyā ke paṛhne men aur guṇgrahaṇa men prīti hōgī."

Translation —

What can one gain from '*Tarpana*' and 'Śrāddha'? The question is satisfactorily answered by saying that '*tarpana*' means '*tripti*' i.e. satisfaction; 'Śrāddha' means that which is done through 'Śraddhā' i.e. faith. If man does *tarpana* or Śrāddha of those '*pitris*' who are dead, the inference is that if any *pitris* are alive, they should be served with food and water, etc. And the second advantage is that when a man does '*tarpana*' and 'Śrāddha' in the name of those for whom he has love, the result would be that there would be possibility of enlightenment in his mind that as his *pitris* have died, so he also would die. And this consciousness of death would make him afraid of doing anything irreligious or immoral and would make him love doing what is religious and moral. The third advantage from this is that there would be no element of doubt in the distribution of ancestral property because names of people of the last 6 generations, e.g. the name of the father is so-and-so, the name of the grand-father is so-and-so and the name of the great grand-father is so-and-so etc., will be fully known to everyone. The fourth advantage is that learned people should offer food etc. and invite to dinner only noble and spiritually advaneed persons and not fools. The consequence would be that learned people will never be unhappy on account of difficulty in earning their livelihood. They would thus be free from worries and would engage themselves in teaching the '*Śastras*' and in meditation. They would teach only the truth and as this procedure would involve some disregard for the fools, they would also begin to acquire knowledge and good qualities, etc.

Then on pages 42 and 43, the manner in which *Anjali* should be offered in connection with '*tarpana*' and 'srāddha'

is described in detail. On reading all this, everyone would come to the conclusion that Swami Dayanand was in favour of 'śrāddha' and '*tarpana*' of dead persons; but from a perusal of *Samullas* 11 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, it appears that Swami Dayanand was very much against animal sacrifices (yajñas) and 'śrāddhas' and '*tarpana*' etc. of dead persons. He writes :—

گھوڑے گاے وغیرہ حیوان نیز انسان مار کر ھوم کرنا کہیں نہیں لکھا - صرف وام مارگیوں کي کتابوں میں ایسے جھوٹھے معنی لکھے ھیں -

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۳۲۲)

"Ghōṛe gāye vagairah haivān nīz insān mār kar hōm karnā kahīn nahīn likhā, sirf vām-mārgiyōn kī kitābōn men aise jhūṭhe mānī likhe hain".

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 322).

Translation —

It is not written anywhere that oblations should be offered after killing horses, cows and other animals and men. Only *Vam-margis* have given such false interpretation in their books.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page, 322)

And on page 115 of the same book, it is written :—

جس فعل سے سچائی کو قبول کیا جاوے اسکو شردھا اور جو شردھا سے کام کیا جاوے اسی کا نام شرآدھ ھے - اور جس جس عمل سے ترپتي یعني زندہ ماں باپ وغیرہ بزرگ خوش ھوں اور خوش کئے جائیں اسی کا نام ترپن ھے - لیکن وہ زندوں کے لئے ھے - مردوں کے لئے نہیں -

"Jis fe'l se sachhāyī kō qabūl kiyā jāve uskō śraddhā aur jo śraddhā se kām kiyā jāve usī kā nām 'śrāddha' hai. Aur jis jis amal se tripti yānī zindā mān bāp vagairah buzurg khush hōn aur khush kiye jāyen, usī kā nām tarpaṇa hai. Lekin voh zindōn ke liye hai, murdōn ke liye nahīn."

Translation —

Whatever action means acceptance of and faith in truth is known as 'sraddhā' and whatever is done with 'sraddhā' is known as 'srāddha'. And from whatever activities, living father, mother and other elders become happy, i. e. become satisfied and are made happy, those activities are known as '*tarpana*.' But this refers to those who are alive and not to those who are dead.

XII

REGARDING REPETITION OF HOLY NAME

102. The ideas of Swami Dayanand regarding the repetition of the Holy Name have already been given in paragraph 77. Swami Dayanand has written in *Samullas* 11 of Satyārtha Prakāsa that mere repetition of the Name does not produce any result. For example, mere repetition of the name 'misrī' does not make one's tongue sweet and the repetition of the word '*neem*' does not make one's taste bitter. But in *Samullas* 4 of the same book, people are directed that when a child is born, it should first be bathed and thereafter the navel string should be cut, i.e. a soft thread should be tied near the root of the navel and then leaving about three inches of it, the string may be cut. Then the house should be thoroughly cleaned and oblations of ghee should be offered.

بعد ازاں بچھ کے کان میں باپ 'ویدوسي' اتی یعنی 'تو وید (صاحب شعور یا چیتن) هے' سناکر گھی اور شھد کو لیکر سونے کی سلائی سے زبان پر لفظ 'اوم' لکھ کر شھد اور گھی کو اسی سلائی سے چٹاوے - پھر بچھ ماں کو دیدے -

"Bād azān bachche ke kān men bāp 'Vedosi' iti yānī tū veda (sāhabe śa'ūr yā chetan) hai sunākar ghee aur śahad kō lekar

253. It appears after enquiry that these young people have been taught that the claim of religion 'that there is a Creator of this world' is absolutely false. They have been made to understand that there is neither any spirit nor any Creator and the world has come into existence of its own accord and goes on without anybody's help. In the beginning, the earth on which we live was a globe of glowing gas and on account of its continued revolutions in the void, its heat was reduced and there was contraction in it and when there was sufficient decrease in its heat, there was considerable contraction and then came a time when this globe of glowing gas was converted into one of oceans and rocks and the atmosphere which we now find round the earth surrounded it on all sides. Thus when these changes had taken place, water of the oceans, evaporating due to the heat of the Sun, formed into clouds and it began to rain, rivers began to flow at different places and the stones of the rocks were converted into sand and began to flow with the water. This sand began to deposit at the mouths of the rivers and when this sand was deposited in suffieient quantities, plains of even land came into existence. Millions and millions of years ago, particles of protoplasm began to show signs of life in the water which then covered the entire earth. Nobody knows from where or how these particles of protoplasm came into existence, but it is definite that they did appear at that time on the surface of the water. This was the beginning of the living creation. After this, the first age of the creation commenced which lasted for twelve million years. Vegetable life appeared during this period and forests came into existence and fish in rivers and other aquatic animals appeared in water. This age was followed by other ages and reptiles, birds and large-sized quadrupeds began to roam on the earth, while crocodiles, whales etc. and other frightful creatures began to dominate the seas. After the lapse of some more time, deer, horses, lions, he-buffaloes, monkeys etc. made their appearance and ultimately man,

of Lala Jagannath, a rich man of the place and in connection with this engaged eleven *Brahmans* at -/8/- per day and every one of them was required to repeat the *Gayatri*[1] *mantra* 1000 times every day and also to make Lala Jagannath repeat the same. Thus eleven *Pandits* in eleven days repeated the *Gayatri mantra* eleven thousand times each and for eleven days there were 'havans'.[2]

(Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand by Mahāśaya Lakshamaṇa P. 144).

Would somebody say what advantage could have accrued from the repetition of the *Gayatri mantra* by these hired *Brahmans*, when, according to Swami Dayanand himself, the repetition of the Name even by one's own self is useless?

XIII

REGARDING JIVA AND BRAHMA BEING ONE

103. As regards *Jiva* and *Brahma* being one, the ideas of Swami Dayanand continued to change. From the conversation which took place between *Sadhu* Iśwar Singh and Swami Dayanand and which is recorded in paragraph 55, it is clear that Swami Dayanand believed at first in *Jiva* and *Brahma* being one, but after he had read all the four *Vedas*, his opinion changed and he began to hold that the belief that *Jiva* and *Brahma* are one is opposed to the *Vedic* Religion. But when *Sadhu* Iśwar Singh quoted the authority of the *Vedas* in support of his views, Swami

1. 'Gāyatrī' is the well-known sacred verse (III—62—10) of the Ṛig-Veda तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्—(Tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahi dhiyo yō naḥ prachōdayāt), repetition of which is considerd to bring great spiritual merit. It is known as 'Gāyatrī' as it is composed in 'Gāyatrī' metre. 2. 'Havana' is offering of oblations in fire as a part of the daily duties of a house-holder.

Dayanand immediately agreed that *Jiva* and *Brahma* were one, even though the example of the hut and the '*Akaśa*' that Swami Dayanand had given was unparallelled !!

XIV

REGARDING THE VEDAS

104. The belief of Swami Dayanand regarding the *Vedas* themselves did not remain the same throughout. For example, it is stated on page 214 of Satyārtha Prakāśa (13th Hindi Edition) as follows :—

"प्रश्न—वेद किन ग्रन्थों का नाम है ?

उत्तर—ऋग्, यजुर्, साम और अथर्व मंत्र संहिताओं का, अन्य को नहीं।"

"Praśna—Veda kin granthōn kā nām hai ?

Uttar —Ṛig, Yajur, Sāma aur Atharva Mantra-samhitāon kā, anya kā nahīn.

Translation —

Question—Which books are known as the *Vedas* ?

Answer —The *Mantra* texts, known as Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda and Atharva-Veda and no others.

And it has been established in the Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, on the authority of the *Vedas*, that Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda and *Chhand* i.e. Atharva-Veda have all been revealed by God and that the words used in the *Vedas* are eternal and the reason given is that as the knowledge of God and His actions are both eternal, all the powers of God must also be eternal and as the *Vedas* constitute Divine Knowledge, they are also eternal and they always continue to form part of the knowledge of God.

(Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā 1st Urdu Edi., Pp. 18-19)

But in an unpublished letter of his which Swami Dayanand wrote in reply to the questions of Swami Kalyāna Ānand, he has said something quite different. It is stated there :—

वेद नाम कागज पर अंकित स्याही का कपड़े की बनी हुई जिल्द का नहीं है, किन्तु विश्व का ज्ञान है......... । ज्ञान का समुद्र अनन्त, अपार, अथाह है, उसे किसी कागज के कूजे में बंद नहीं किया जा सकता । 'वेद सत्य विद्याओं की पुस्तक' का अर्थ यही है कि ऋषियों के संचित अनुभव से लाभ तथा सत्य का अन्वेषण करना । किसी व्यक्ति विशेष या पुस्तक विशेष की दासता ने ही मानव समाज में गुलामी का भाव घुसा दिया है । विश्व परिचय और समस्त संसार का इतिहास सच्चा वेद भाष्य है । संसार सबसे बड़ा शास्त्र है ।

"Veda nām kāgaz par ankit siyāhī kā kapṛe kī banī huyee jild kā nahīn hai, kintu viśva kā jñāna hai ... ... Jñāna kā samudra anant, apār, athāh hai, use kisī kāgaz ke kūze men band nahīn kiyā jā saktā. 'Veda satya vidyāōn kī pustak' kā arth yehī hai ki Ṛishiyōn ke sanchit anubhav se lābh tathā satya kā anveshaṇ karnā. Kisī vyakti viśesh yā pustak viśesh kī dāstā ne hī mānav samāj men gulāmī kā bhāv ghusā diyā hai.........Viśva parichaya aur samast sansār kā itihās schchā Veda bhāshya hai. Sansār sab se baṛā śāstra hai."

Translation —

Veda is not the name of the volume of sheets of paper printed on with ink and bound with cloth but it means the 'Knowledge of the Universe'. The Ocean of Knowledge is unlimited, infinite and unfathomable. It cannot be confined within the small limits of paper[1]. The meaning of the expression '*Vedas* are books of true knowledge' is only that one should derive benefit from the accumulated experience of *Rishis* and should investigate truth. Slavery to a particular person or to a particular book has engrained feelings of slavery in

---

1. As if the Vedas are not limited to and confined within the four, Rig-Veda, Yajur-Veda, Sāma-Veda and Atharva-Veda.

the minds of human beings[1]. Knowledge of the Universe and the history of the entire world is the true commentary on the *Vedas*.........The world itself is the most important *Śastra*.

This is evidently the belief of the Brahmo Samaj. In short, the special regard for the four *Vedas* has vanished and the following saying of the Brahmo Samaj has been accepted:—

چشمیداری و عالمے در نظر است ۔
دیگرچہ معلم و کتابت باید ۔

"Chashmedārī va Ālime dar nazar ast,
Dīgarche mu'allim va kitābat bāyad."

Translation —

If you have an eye and the entire world is before you, what need have you of any other teacher or book ?

Readers would be surprised to know that the matter does not end here. Rai Bahadur Bhola Nath was a famous social reformer at Ahmedabad (Gujerat) and he was also the President of the Ahmedabad Prārthanā Samāj, which was a branch of the Brahmo Samāj. His son, Mr. Krishna Rao Bhola Nath wrote his biography in English and Gujerati languages. In the Gujerati version of his biography an account of the meeting between Bhola Nath ji and Swami Dayanand has also been given. This meeting took place in December 1874. Swami Dayanand wished that the name of the 'Prārthanā Samāj' be changed into 'Arya Samaj', but Bhola Nathji asked how could the name of the 'Prārthanā Samāj' be changed into 'Ārya Samaj' when there was a great difference between the principles of the two societies. Readers would do well to read the actual words of the conversation between the two leaders:—

भोलानाथ जी—स्वामी जी, आप वेद को ईश्वर प्रणीत बताते

1. As if Swami Dayanand is not a believer in any book even though it may be Rig, Yajur, Sāma or Atharva-Veda.

का प्रयत्न करते हो, सो बुद्धिमान लोक के सामने तो व्यर्थ है।

स्वामी जी—यह सब बात तो सच है, परन्तु भोलानाथ जी, ऐसे समझाए सिवाय लोक सब अपने संग कैसे आने वाले ? और गाड़ी चले कैसे ?

"Bhōlā Nāthjī—Swāmijī, Āp Veda kō Īśwar praṇīt batāne kā prayatna karte hō, sō buddhimān lōk ke sāmne tō vyartha hai.

Swamijl—Yeh sab bāt tō sach hai, parantu Bhola Nathji, aise samjhāye siwāye lōk sab apne sang kaise āne vāle ? aur apnī gāṛī chale kaise ?"

Translation—

Bhola Nathji—"Swamiji, you are making an effort to establish that the *Vedas* are divine revelation. This statement is meaningless for those who are intelligent !"

Swamiji—"All this is quite true. But Bhola Nathji, if I do not explain matters in this light, how will people follow me and how will I succeed in carrying on ?"

In short, Bhola Nathji remained firm and the Prārthanā Samāj continued as 'Prārthanā Samāj. The author of the biography after referring to this incident writes :—

الغرض پرارتھنا سماج ایک ایسی سوسائٹی کے ساتھ مل جانے کی آفت سے بچ گئی جو ایسے (سوامی دیانند جی سے) سچے آدمی کو ایک نمایاں اور سربرآوردہ درجہ دیتی ھے - ھم کو اس وجہ سے خدا کا شکر ادا کرنا چاھئے -

(سوامي دیانند اور انکی تعلیم - پرشٹھ ۲۴۲-۲۴۳)

Algaraz Prārthanā Samāj ek aisī society ke sāth mil jāne kī āfat se bach gayee jō aise (Swami Dayanand ji se) sachche ādmī kō ek numāyān aur sarbarāvurdā darjā detī hai. Ham kō is vajah se Khudā kā śukr adā karnā chāhiye."

(Swami Dayanand aur unkī Tālīm, pages 242-243).

Translation—

In short, Prārthanā Samāj was saved from the calamity of joining such a society which gives a high and noble place to such an honest person as Swami Dayanand. We should thank God for this mercy!
(Swami Dayanand aur unkī Tālīm, pages 242 & 243)

In addition, it is stated on page 5 of the pamphlet "Daśa Praśnī".

एक बार सन् १८७७ में वह लाहौर से पश्चिमोत्तर कहीं प्रचारार्थ जाने वाले थे। गाड़ी में अभी कुछ देर थी। हम सब प्लेटफ़ार्म पर खड़े थे। बेंच मौजूद न था। पुस्तकों के गट्ठे बँधे हुए रक्खे थे। श्री स्वामी जी उनमें से ही एक पर बैठ गए। हम में से किसी ने कहा—'महाराज आप तो वेदों पर बैठ गए हैं। क्या इससे उनका अपमान नहीं होता?' 'नहीं', झट स्वामी जी ने उत्तर दिया। 'मैं तो उन कागज़ों पर बैठा हूँ जिन पर वेद छपे हुए हैं। इससे वेदों का निरादर नहीं होता'।

"Ek bār san 1877 men voh Lahore se Paśchimōttar men kahīn prachārārth jāne vāle the. Gāṛī men abhī kuchh der thī. Ham sab platform par khaṛe the. Bench maujūd na thā. Pustakōn ke gaṭṭhe bandhe hue rakkhe the. Śrī Swamiji unmen se hī ek par baiṭh gaye. Ham men se kisī ne kahā—'Mahārāj āp tō Vedōn par baiṭh gaye hain. Kyā is se unkā apmān nahīn hōtā?' 'Nahīn', jhaṭ Swamiji ne uttar diyā. 'Main tō un kāgazōn par baiṭhā hūn jin par Veda chhape hue hain. Is se Vedōn kā nirādar nahīn hōtā.'

Translation—

Once in 1877 Swami Dayanand was about to go from Lahore to some place on the North-West Frontier for the propagation of his views. There was still some time for the train to come and we were all standing on the platform and there was no bench at all. Bundles of books were lying there. Swami Dayanand sat down

on one of them. One of us said to him, 'Maharaj, you have sat down on the *Vedas*. Does this not mean disrespect to them ?' Swamiji promptly replied, 'No, I am sitting on those papers on which the *Vedas* are printed. This does not mean any disrespect to the *Vedas*.'"

If the statement in 1874 that the *Vedas* are divine revelation was made merely to attract the attention of the Hindu public towards Arya Samaj and if in 1877 the volumes of the *Vedas* are used to serve as seats to sit on, then obviously in 1934 there should be no difference between the beliefs of the Arya Samajists and the Satsangis regarding the *Vedas*. It is also surprising that Swami Dayanand, who was a *Brahmachari*[1] all through his life and was so strongly built and healthy, could not remain standing on his legs till the arrival of the train !

XV

EXAMPLES OF HIS COMMENTARY

104. Let us now see a few specimens of the commentary of Swami Dayanand so that readers may be able to know how far Swami Dayanand had succeeded in preparing a new commentary of the *Vedas*:—

यजुर्वेद, अध्याय २४, मंत्र २४

'हे मनुष्यो, जैसे पत्तियों का काम जानने वाला जन ऐश्वर्य के लिये बटेरों, प्रकाश के लिये कौलीक नाम के पत्तियों, विद्वानों की

1. Hindus divided man's life into four periods. The first period of 25 years was meant for studies and for leading a life of celibacy. This period was known as Brahmacharya and the person leading such life was known as Brahmachārī. As Swami Dayanand never married, he continued to live as a Brahmachārī.

स्त्रियों के लिए जो गउओं को मारती हैं उन पखेरियों, विद्वानों की बहिनियों के लिए कुलीक नामक पखेरियों, जो अग्नि के समान वर्तमान गृहपालन करने वाला उसके लिए पारुष्ण पक्षियों को प्राप्त होता है, वैसे तुम भी प्राप्त हो।

भावार्थ—जो मनुष्य पक्षियों के स्वभावज कामों को जानकर उनकी अनुहार किया करते हैं वे बहुश्रुत (आलिम) के समान होते हैं।

Yajur-Veda Adhyāya 24, Mantra 24

'He manushyō, jaise pakshiyōn kā kām jānane vālā jan aiśvaryya ke liye baṭerōn, prakāśa ke liye kaulīk nām ke pakshiyōn, vidvānōn kī striyōn ke liye jō gauōn kō mārtī hain un pakheriyōn, vidvānōn kī bahiniyōn ke liye kulīka nāmak pakheriyōn jō agni ke samān vartmān gṛihapālan karne vālā uske liye pārushṇa pakshiyōn kō prāpt hōtā hai, vaise tum bhī prāpt hō."

Bhāvārtha—Jō manushya pakshiyōn ke svabhāvaj kāmōn kō jān kar un kī anuhāri (naqal) kiyā karte hain ve bahuśruta (ālim) ke samān hōte hain.

Translation —

Yajur-Veda Adhyaya 24, Mantra 24

O human beings! Just as the person who knows how birds behave obtains pheasants for ensuring prosperity, obtains *Kaulikas* for light, obtains birds for the wives of learned men which appear to pester the cows, obtains Kulīkas for the sisters of learned men and obtains *Parushna* birds for the head of the family, may you also obtain the same.

Substance—Men who know the natural activities of birds and imitate those activities, are like learned people.

यजुर्वेद अध्याय ८, मंत्र ३१

हे विविध प्रकार से प्रशंसा करने योग्य विद्वान् गृहस्थ लोगो! तुम जिस गृहस्थ के घर में सुवर्ण उत्तम रूप दिव्य गुण स्वभाव व प्रत्येक काम करने की रीति को प्राप्त हो, वह अच्छे प्रकार वाणी और पृथिवी की पालना करने वाला मनुष्यों की सेवा के योग्य है।

Yajur-Veda, Adhyaya 8, Mantra 31.

He vividh prakār se praśansā karne yōgya vidvān gṛihastha lōgō! tum jis gṛihastha ke ghar men suvarṇa uttam rūp divya guṇa svabhāv va pratyek kām ke karne kī rīti kō prāpt hō, voh achchhe prakār vāṇī aur pṛithivī kī pālanā karne vālā manushyōn kī sevā ke yōgya hai."

Translation—

O You Learned householders, who deserve to be praised in various ways, that 'gṛihastha' in whose house you learn doing work cheerfully and with lofty motives and in prescribed ways, who maintains an even temper and clean premises, is worthy of being served by men.

यजुर्वेद अध्याय ६, मंत्र १४

हे शिष्य, मैं विविध शिक्षाओं से तेरी जिसमें बोलता है उस वाणी को शुद्ध अर्थात् सद्धर्मानुकूल करता हूँ। तेरे जिससे देखता है उस नेत्र को शुद्ध करता हूँ। तेरी जिससे नाड़ी आदि बाँधे जाते हैं उस नाभि को पवित्र करता हूँ। तेरे जिससे मूत्रोत्सर्गादि किये जाते हैं उस लिङ्ग को पवित्र करता हूँ। तेरे जिससे रक्षा की जाती है उस गुदेन्द्रिय को पवित्र करता हूँ। समस्त व्यवहारों को पवित्र शुद्ध अर्थात् धर्म के अनुकूल करता हूँ। तथा गुरु पत्नी पक्ष में सर्वत्र 'करती हूँ' यह योजना करनी चाहिये।

Yajur-Veda Adhyāya 6, Mantra 14.

He śishya, main vividh sikshāōn se terī jismen bōlatā hai us vāṇī kō śuddh arthāt śaddharmānukūl kartā hūn; tere jis se dekhtā hai us netra kō śuddh karta hūn; terī jis se nāḍī ādi bāndhe jāte hain us nābhi kō pavitra kartā hūn, tere jis se mūtrōtsargādi kiye jāte hain us ling kō pavitra kartā hūn; tere jis se rakshā ki jātī hāi us gudendriya kō pavitra kartā hūn. Samast vyavahārōn kō pavitra śuddh arthāt dharma ke anukūl kartā hūn. Tathā Guru-patnī paksh men sarvatra 'kartī hūn', yeh yōjanā karnī chāhiye.

Translation —

Yajur-Veda Adhyāya 6, Mantra 14,

O Disciple, by giving instructions in various ways I make thy speech pure i.e. make it accord with the principles of right conduct, I make pure thy eye by which thou see-est, I make thy navel pure to which the navel string is tied, I sanctify that organ of thine by which thou passest urine etc. and I sanctify thy rectum which protects thy health. I thus make all thine activities sanctified, i.e. make them accord with true religion. In the case of *Guru's* wife the verb will be taken to be in the feminine gender in place of the masculine[1].

ऋग्वेद मंडल ३, सूक्त ५३, मंत्र १४

हे विद्वान्, आपके अनार्य देशों में बसने वालों में गऊओं से नहीं दुग्ध आदि को दुहते हैं, दिन को नहीं तपाते हैं, वे क्या करते वा करेंगे और आप हम लोगों के लिए जो अच्छे घराने का मुझको मिलता है उसके धन को सब प्रकार से धारण करिये और हे श्रेष्ठ, धन से युक्त आप हम लोगों से नीची शक्ति जिसमें हो उसको अलहदा रखिये।

Rig-Veda Manḍala 3, Sūkta 53, Mantra 14

He vidvān, āpke anārya deśōn men basne vālōn men gauōn se nahīn dugdh ādi kō duhate hain, din kō nahīn tapāte hain, ve kyā karte vā karenge aur āp ham lōgōn ke liye jō achchhe gharāne kā mujhkō miltā hai uske dhan kō sab prakār se dhāraṇ kariye aur he śreshṭh, dhan se yukta āp ham lōgōn se nīchī śakti jismen hō uskō alahdā rakhiye.

Translation —

Rig-Veda Manḍala 3, Sūkta 53, Mantra 14

O learned man, what can those people who

---

1. It should be noted that in this mantra Gurus and wives of Gurus have been directed that they should bless their male and female disciples in the above frank and outspoken words.

live in the village of 'non-Aryans' and who do not milch their cattle for milk and who do not heat the milk during the day, do at all or what will they do? By all means, you receive for us the wealth of that person of noble family who comes to me and also keep apart those people who are weaker than us.

यजुर्वेद अध्याय १७, मंत्र ६५

हे वीरो, तुम बिजली से अत्यन्त सुख और पात्र में पकाये हुए चावल, दाल, तरकारी कढ़ी आदि भोजन को हाथों में धारण किए हुए पराक्रम करो, इत्यादि।

Yajur-Veda Adhaya 17, Mantra 65

"He Vīrō,[1] tum bijlī se atyant sukh aur pātra men pakāye huye chāval, dāl, tarkārī, kaṛhī ādi bhōjan kō hāthōn men dhārāṇ kiye huye parākram karō, ityādi."

Translation —

Yajur-Veda Adhyāya 17, Mantra 65

O Brave People, you derive utmost benefit from electricity and you should work hard while holding in your hand eatables like rice, pulses, vegetables, curry, etc. cooked in vessels.

यजुर्वेद अध्याय ११, मंत्र ३३

हे राजन्, जैसे रक्षक विद्वान् का पवित्र शिष्य सुखदायक अग्नि आदि पदार्थों को प्राप्त हुआ, वेदार्थ जानने द्वारा तर्क वितर्क के साथ संपूर्ण विद्याओं का वेत्ता जिस सूर्य के समान शत्रुओं को मारने और शत्रुओं के नगरों को नष्ट करने वाले आपको तेजस्वी करता है वैसे उन आपको, सब विद्वान् लोग, विद्या और विनय से उन्नति युक्त करें।

1. If the word 'Vīrō' refers to 'soldiers standing in battle-field' the meaning of the words 'parākram karō' would then be, 'fight well', but how would they be able to fight well while holding curry, rice etc. in their hands?

Yajur-Veda Adhyāya 11 Mantra 33

He Rājan, jaise rakshak vidvān kā pavitra śishya sukhdāyak agni ādi padārthōn kō prāpta huā, vedārth jānane hārā, tark vitark ke sāṭh sampūrṇa vidyāōn kā vettā jis sūrya ke samān śatruōn kō mārne aur śatruōn ke nagarōn kō nashṭ karne vāle āpkō tejasvī kartā hai vaise un āpkō sab vidvān lōg vidyā aur vinaya se unnati-yukta karen.

Translation—

Yajur-Veda, Adhyāya 11, Mantra 33.

O King, just as the noble disciple of the learned man who protects others attained '*agni*' and other substances which lead to man's happiness, similarly the *Rishi*, who knows the meaning of the *Vedas* and who possesses all knowledge and arguments in favour of or against different theories and who makes you fit like the sun for killing the enemies and destroying their cities, may provide you with learning and good manners and enable you to progress.

رگ وید منڈل ۱۰ ۔ سوکت ۴۰ ۔ منتر ۲

اے عورت مردو ! جیسے دیور کے ساتھ بیوہ یکجا ہو اور بیاہی عورت اپنے خاوند سے ہم بستری کرکے اولاد کو بہر طور پیدا کرتی ہے ویسے تم دونوں بیاہتا عورت مرد کہاں رات اور کہاں دن میں بسے تھے ؟ کہاں اشیاء کو حاصل کیا ؟ اور کس، وقت کہاں رہتے رہے ؟ تمہارے سونے کی جگہ (گھر) کہاں ہے ؟ نیز کون ہو یا کس ملک کے رہنے والے ہو ؟

"Rig-Veda Maṇḍala 10, Sūkta 40, Mantra 2

"Ai aurat mardō, jaise devar ke sāth bevah yakjā hō aur byāhī aurat apne khāvind se hambīstarī karke aulād kō bahar taur paidā kartī hai, vaise tum dōnōn byāhatā aurat mard kahān rāt aur kahān din men base the ? Kahān ashiyā kō hāsil kiyā ? Aur kis vakt kahān rahte rahe ? Tumhāre sōne kī jagah (ghar) kahān hai ? Nīz kaun hō yā kis mulk ke rahne vāle hō ?

Translation —

Rig-Veda Maṇḍala 10, Sūkta 40, Mantra 2.

O women and men! just as a widow unites with her husband's younger brother and a married woman and her husband join together on one bed and produce children in all possible ways; in the same way where did you stay during the night and during the day? Where did you get all the things and at what time and at what place did you stay and at what place did you sleep? Also please say who you are and to what country you belong.

105. And it is a very strange thing that one comes across such *mantras* in his commentary as have been translated at one place in one way and at another place in quite a different way. Someone may observe regarding this that the translation may have been done according to the context and the particular place where a particular *mantra* is given, for it is quite possible that at a particular place a particular subject may have been dealt with and at another place, a different subject. Naturally therefore the translation or substance of the same *mantra* given at two places should be different, but as has already been shown in paras 50 and 44, the same *mantra* dealing with one and the same subject-matter has been translated by Swami Dayanand in his Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā in one way and in his commentary on the *Vedas* in another way. Similarly, (in para 95) there is mention of *mantra* 43, Adhyaya 33 of Yajur-Veda. The translation of this *mantra* in the Bhashya (commentary) of Swami Dayanand is given below :—

हे मनुष्यो ! जो रमणीय स्वरूप से आकर्षण से परस्पर सम्बद्ध लोक मात्र के साथ अपने भ्रमण की आवृत्ति करता हुआ सब लोकों को दिखाता हुआ प्रकाशमान सूर्यदेव जल व अविनाशी आकाशादि और मरणधर्मा प्राणिमात्र को अपने अपने प्रदेश में स्थापित करता हुआ उदयास्त समय में आता जाता है सो ईश्वर का बनाया सूर्य लोक है।

He manushyō jō ramaṇīya svarūp se. ākarshaṇ se paraspar sambaddh lōka mātra ke sāth apne bhramaṇ kī āvṛiti kartā huā sab lōkōn kō dikhātā huā prakāśmān Sūryadev jal va avināśī ākāśādi aur maraṇadharmā prāṇimātra kō apne apne pradeśa men sthāpit kartā huā udayast samaya men ātā jātā hai, sō Īśvara kā banāyā Sūryalōka hai. (43)

Translation —

O Human Beings ! The Luminous Sun which appears charming and which repeats its revolutions along with other *Lokas* connected with it by mutual gravitation, makes all the *Lokas* visible, maintains the waters and imperishable sky as well as mortal living beings in their respective places, comes and goes at the time of the rising and the setting of the sun. That solar region was made by God.

But this *mantra* is again repeated as Mantra 31 Adhyaya 34 of Yajur-Veda where Swami Dayanand has translated it as below :—

हे विद्वन्! आप जो आकर्षित हुए लोक समूह के साथ वर्तमान निरंतर नाशरहित कारण और नाशसहित कार्य को अपनी अपनी कक्षा में स्थित करता हुआ तेजःस्वरूप रमणीय स्वरूप के सहित ऐश्वर्य का दाता देदीप्यमान विद्युत रूप अग्नि संसारस्थ वस्तुओं को प्राप्त होता है, उसको देखते हुए सम्यक प्रयुक्त कीजिए। (३१)

He Vidvan ! Āp jō ākarshit hue lōka samūh ke sāth vartmān nirantar nāśrahit kāraṇ aur nāśsahit kārya kō apnī apnī kakshā men sthit kartā huā tejaḥ svarūp ramaṇīya svarūp ke sahit aiśvarya kā dātā dedīpyamān vidyutrūp agnī sansārasth vastuōn kō prāpt hōtā hai uskō dekhte hue samyak prayukta kījiye. (31)

Translation —

O Learned man ! you should make full and complete use of the luminous Agni, in the form of electricity which shines brightly and is very charming

and which co-exists with all the *Lokas* attracted towards it and which eternally establishes imperishable causes and perishable effects and activities in their respective places and provides all the things of the world and makes people prosperus.

Swami Dayanand has given the following heading to this *mantra* in Chapter 33.

अब सूर्य मंडल कैसा है, इस विषय का उपदेश किया है

"Ab Sūrya maṇḍal kaisā hai, is vishaya kā updeśa kiyā hai."

Translation —

'What the solar system is like, is now described.

But in Adhyāya 34 the following heading has been given :—

अब विद्युत् से क्या सिद्ध करना चाहिए, इस विषय का उपदेश किया है।

"Ab vidyut se kyā siddh karnā chāhiye, is vishaya kā updeśa kiyā hai."

Translation —

Now instructions are given regarding what should be achieved with the help of electricity.

It is clear from these headings themselves that this *mantra* 33 describes the solar sphere in Adhyāya 33 but in Adhyāya 34 it deals with the subject of electricity.

It would perhaps be derogatory to the translator if we say that while translating Adhyāya 34 he did not remember that he had already translated this *mantra* in Adhyāya 33 in a different manner. All the same it would be quite proper and also correct to point out here that the two translations are entirely different from each other.

XVI

CLAIMS AND BELIEFS REGARDING THE VEDAS

106. In this connection it appears reasonable to examine to some extent the claims and beliefs of Swami Dayanand regarding the *Vedas* with a view to finding out what force is there in the arguments which he has advanced to prove that the *Vedas* are God's revelation i. e. inspiration. It is with great regret that we have to state that most of the arguments advanced by him are so weak that on reading them it becomes impossible for a Satsangi to look upon the claims of Swami Dayanand with consideration and respect.

107. One great difficulty is that Swami Dayanand on the one hand says that there is no other book excepting the *Vedas* which can be said to be authoritative in itself, while on the other, he gives references and quotations from other books to establish the claims he has advanced regarding the *Vedas*. For example, in *Samullas* 7 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, Swami Dayanand has raised the question, viz, "To whom and when did God reveal the *Vedas*?" and in reply to it, he has referred to Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (11-4-2-3) and has written that "in the beginning of the creation God revealed one *Veda* each to the souls of *Rishis Agni*, *Vayu*, *Aditya* and *Angira*."[1] Now it is not clear how any one could accept this answer as correct and when the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is not an authoritative book, no value can be attached to references of that book and in any case this reference could be given only by a person and for that person both of whom may be believing the statements of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as authoritative.

108 Then the question has been raised why the

1. Vide Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 233 and 234.

Vedas were revealed to those four *Rishis* only and not to others. The reply given is that those four *Rishis* were the holiest of all the *Jivas* and others were not like them and as such, sacred knowledge was revealed to their Souls[1] only. But the questions, viz, 'What special virtues did those four *Rishis* possess on account of which they were considered holier than others?' and 'What proof is there to show that they were really holier than others?' have not been answered. More or less, his argument is that the *Vedas* were revealed to those four *Rishis* because they were holier than all other *Jivas* and the proof of these four *Rishis* being holier than others is that the *Vedas* were revealed to them alone. Was it not necessary for the person, who expected others to quote authority from the *Vedas* for everything they said, to refer to some authority of the *Vedas* when he replied to such an important question as the above?

It is written in *Samullas* 9 of the Satyārtha Prakāśa that man gets salvation for a fixed period of time only and that every liberated spirit has to return to the world on the expiry of that period. Was it not the case that these four *Rishis* were those spirits whose period of salvation had expired and who returned to this earth on the completion of that period? Under these circumstances, it is no doubt established that those *Rishis* were holier and more eminent than others and they were worthy of being selected, but when it is claimed that the creation came into being and was dissolved infinite number of times and the *Vedic* religion has continued since the beginning and that infinite number of *Rishis* were born in infinite number of creations, were there only four spirits in the beginning of the present creation living as liberated spirits whose period of salvation had come to an end? Obviously, this would cast serious aspersions on the arrangements made by God regarding achievement of salvation and the efficacy of the *Vedic* religion in this connection.

1. Vide Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, page 234.

109. Then another question has been raised. 'For what reason did God not reveal the *Vedas* in the language of any country but revealed them in Sanskrit only which was not the language of any particular country?' The reply given is that if God had revealed the *Vedas* in the language of any particular country, He would have been held partial, for the study and teaching of the *Vedas* would have been conveniently done by the people of the country in the language of which the *Vedas* had been revealed while the people of other countries would have found it difficult to do so[1]. It is really extraordinary that God thought of the quality of His justice[2] only to the extent that the people of the world may not have to experience unequal difficulty in understanding the *Vedas*. But were most of the countries of the world inhabited when the *Vedas* were revealed and were many languages prevalent in the world at that time? It takes hundreds of years for countries of the world to get inhabited and different languages to develop and become popular among people. Should it not be concluded from this reply of Swami Dayanand that the *Vedas* were not revealed in the beginning of the creation but were revealed after the countries of the world had been inhabited and different languages had developed? Besides, what has happened to God's justice now, for the true meaning of the *Vedas* have become known to Swami Dayanand and through him to the Arya Samajist brothers and all the rest of the world is deprived of the blessing? What fault had Sāyana and other *Acharyas* of the past (whose commentaries have been declared by Swami Dayanand to be quite wrong) and those who believe in the correctness of their commentaries committed and what works of merit had been done by the Arya Samajists of the present time on account of which God discarded His principle of equality? And how can one understand the position that God revealed both the *Vedas* and

1. Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 234. 2. The subject of the 'Justice of God' shall be discussed in detail later on.

the true meanings of the *Vedas* to the Arya Samajists and contented Himself with revealing only the *mantras* of the *Vedas* (and not their meanings) to those four *Rishis* to whom the *Vedas* were revealed in the beginning of the creation and who had been considered to be the holiest of men ?

110. Then the question arises as to what proof is there to establish that the *Vedas* are Divine Revelation. Evidently, this question is a very reasonable one but the three answers that have been given to it are so extraordinary that one feels extremely surprised to read them. The first answer is that the book which contains statements in accordance with the *Guna*, *Karma* and *Svabhava*[1] of God should be accepted as Divine Revelation ; the second answer is that just as knowledge of God is free from all doubts and mistakes, the books which contain knowledge free from all doubts and mistakes should be taken as Divine Revelation. But how could the poor man know the *Guna*, *Karma* and *Svabhava* of God ? Does Swami Dayanand want that man should first take pains to get acquainted with the *Guna*, *Karma* and *Svabhava* of God and thereafter study the *Vedas* to find ont the *Guna*, *Karma* and *Svabhava* of God ? Obviously, if a person has been able to know the *Guna*, *Karma* and *Svabhava* of God, what need has he then to study the *Vedas* at all ? And as regards the second answer the whole world would say that the authoritative meaning of the knowledge thus imparted should be explained to them before they could make out how far that knowledge is free from faults. When as many as four meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are given and it is said that the *Vedas* have as many as 1127 *śakhas* i.e. interpretations, which of these interpretations should be examined ? It is admitted that Swami Dayanand has written his commentary on the Mādhyandinī *śakha* of Yajur-Veda and

1. The words 'Guṇa, Karma, Svabhāva' are often used together and mean 'qualities or attributes (Guṇa), actions (Karma) and temperament or nature (Svabhāva)' of any person or Being.

the Asvalāyanī *śakha* of Rig-Veda[1] which shows that according to his beliefs, the two *śakhas* of these two *Vedas* are authoritative. But is there any reason why other people also should accept these *śakhas* as authoritative ? The third answer that Swami Dayanand has given is that the book which contains any *pratyaksha* and other proofs in connection with the creation and also does not contain statements against the behaviour and conduct of noble and well-behaved people, should be accepted as divine revelation. But one comes across in the *Vedas* not only one or two but scores of such *mantras*, on thinking over the meaning of which one feels disgusted. Readers may peruse the examples given below and decide for themselves how far the subject-matter of these accords with the system of evolution of the creation, the *pratyaksha* and other proofs and the behaviour and conduct of noble and well-behaved people :—

(अ) हे राजपुरुष ! आप धर्म के द्वेषी शत्रुओं को निरन्तर जलाइये । हे सम्यक् तेजधारी जन ! जो हमारे शत्रु को उत्साही करता है उसको नीची दशा में करके सूखे काष्ठ के समान जलाइये ।

(यजुर्वेद भाष्य, स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती, अध्याय १३ मंत्र १२)

(ब) घोड़े में, खच्चर में, मस्त बकरे में जो कुव्वते बाह है उसको इस.........में क़ायम कर । (अथर्ववेद काण्ड ४ सूक्त ४ मंत्र ८)

(स) ओखली के सामने जाकर एक बरहना औरत इस तरह कहती है कि जिस तरह दरख्त से काट कर बनाया हुआ मूसल तेरे लिए है उसी तरह मेरे लिए भी...है । (अथर्ववेद काण्ड २०, सूक्त १३६, मंत्र ६)

(a)............He Raj Prursh ! Āp dharma ke dveshī śatruōn kō nirantar jalāiye. He samyak Tejdhārī Jan, jō hamāre śatru kō utsāhī kartā hai uskō nīchī daśā men karke sūkhe kāshṭh ke samān jalāiye.

(Yajur-Veda Bhāshya by Swami Dayanand Saraswati, 13—12).

---

1. It is strange that the Śākhās are spoken of as commentaries and the Samhitās as the real or original Vedas, but Swami Dayanand has written commentaries of the Śākhās. Where are those real or original Vedas then, which the Arya Samajists believe in and compel the people of the whole world to believe in ?

(b) Ghōṛe men, khachchar men, mast bakre men jō qūvvate bāh hai, uskō is......men qāim kar.

(Atharva-Veda Kāṇḍa 4, Mantra 8).

(c) Okhlī ke sāmne jākar ek barahnā aurat is tarah kahtī hai ke jis tarah darakht se kāṭ kar banāyā huā mūsal tere liye hai, usī tarah mere liye bhī.........hai.

(Atharva-Veda Kāṇḍa 20, Sūkta 136, Mantra 6)

Translation —

(a) O Government Official ! You should please burn those who are enemies of religion. O Man of Great Splendour, You suspend him with head downwards, who encourages our enemies and burn him like dry wood. (Yajur-Veda Bhāshya, Swami Dayanand Saraswati, Adhyaya 13, Mantra 12).

(b) The reproductive power which the horse, the mule and the he-goat possess should be gifted to this[1]...

(Atharva-Veda, 4—4—8).

(c) A naked woman goes near a mortar and says, "Just as the pestle made out of timber cut from a tree is intended for you, similarly, here is.......for me also[1]." (Atharva-Veda 20-136-6).

111. It is stated in *Samullas* 7, Satyārtha Prakāśa (4th Urdu Edition) as below:—

انسان کو ''اس قسم کی پرارتھنا کبھي نه کرنی چاهئے اور نه
پرمیشور اُس کو قبول کرتا هے جیسے که یه هے که اے پرمیشور
آپ میرے دشمنوں کو فنا کرو - مجھ کو سب سے بڑا بناؤ - میری
هي نیک نامي هو اور سب میرے ماتحت هو جاویں ''

Insān kō is qism kī prārthanā kabhī na karnī chāhiye aur na Parmeśvara uskō qabūl kartā hai, jaise ki yeh hai ke 'Ai Parmeśvara, āp mere duśmanōn kō fanā karō, mujhkō sab se baṛā banāō, merī hī neknāmī hō aur sab mere mātehat hō jāven."

1. The statements are so obscene that one feels ashamed to record them here.

Translation—

Man should never make such prayers as this, 'O God, destroy my enemies, make me the greatest of all men, give me fame and all others may become subordinate to me', nor does God accept such prayers.
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, page 212).

Really, this is a very noble teaching worthy of appreciation, provided one really acts upon it. But it is a matter of regret that there are any number of such prayers in the *Vedas* themselves. Should we now act according to the advice of Swami Dayanand or according to the teachings of the *Vedas*? Obviously, when the *Vedas* are accepted as authoritative in themselves, the teaching of the *Vedas* has to be accepted. It is not known why Swami Dayanand has written this against the teaching of the *Vedas* and it is also not understood why God Himself, by including such prayers in the *Vedas*, teaches people to make use of such prayers and also promises to accept them. It is also not clear what Swami Dayanand meant by saying that "God does not accept such prayers." We give below some extracts from the *Vedas* to explain our difficulty in the matter:—

(a) Let us now refer to Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā (1st Urdu Edition, page 144). Swami Dayanand writes there :—

"انسان کو چاهئے که همیشه محنت اور کوشش کرتا رهے اور ایسا اراده رکھے که—

[1]'میں پرمیشور کی عنایت سے سبھادھیکش کا رتبه حاصل کروں - ملک کے راجاؤں پر میری حکومت قائم هو۔ تمام روئے زمین میرے زیرنگیں هو - اور تمام راجاؤں کے درمیان اعلیٰ رتبه اور شهرت پاؤں وغیره' -"

1. From here begins the quotation from the Aitereya Brāhmaṇa.

"Insān kō chāhiye ke hameśā mehnat aur kōshish kartā rahe aur aisā irādā rakkhe ke—

"Main Parmeshwar kī ināyet se Sabhādhyaksha kā rutbā hāsil karūn, mulk mulk ke rājāōn par meri hukūmat qāyam hō, tamām rūe zamin mere zerenagīn hō...........aur tamām rājāōn ke darmyān ālā rutbā aur shōhrat pāūn, vagairah."

Translation—

Man should always work hard and make efforts and should have the desire—

'that with the mercy of God I might attain the rank of the President, that my rule might be established over the kings of different regions, that the entire world may be subordinate to me and that I should attain the highest position and fame amongst the kings of the world etc."

(Aitereya Brahmaṇa, Panchikā 8, Kanḍikā 6)

We were thinking of quoting authority from the *Vedas* but here the statement of Swami Dayanand himself is to the effect that man should try to attain the highest position, fame and authority over the entire world and he has quite clearly advised men to pray for all these things.

(b) Page 142 of the same book, Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā (1st Urdu Edition) may also be referred to. Swami Dayanand has given the translation of *mantra* 2, Sūkta 39, Manḍala 1 of Rig-Veda as below:—

اے انسانو! تمہارے آیدھ یعنی توپ بندوق وغیرہ - ہتھیار میری عنایت سے مضبوط اور فتح نصیب ہوں - بدکردار دشمنوں کی شکست اور تمہاری فتح ہو - تم مضبوط - طاقتور اور کارنمایاں کرنے والے ہو - تم دشمنوں کی فوج کو ہزیمت دے کر انہیں روگرداں و پسپا کرو - تمہاری فوج جرار و کارگزار اور نامی گرامی ہو تاکہ تمہاری عالمگیر حکومت روۓ زمین پر قائم ہو اور تمہارا حریف ناہنجار شکست یاب ہو اور نیچا دیکھے -

Ai insānō, tumhāre āyudh yānī tōp bandūq vagairah hathiār merī ināyet se mazbūt aur fatehnasīb hōn. Badkardār dushmanōn kī shikast aur tumhārī fateh hō, tum mazbūt, tāqatwar aur kār numāyān karne wāle hō, tum dushmanōn kī fauj kō hazīmat dekar unhen rūgardān va paspā karō, tumhārī fauj jarrār va kārguzār aur nāmī girāmī hō tāke tumhārī ālamgīr hukūmat rūe zamīn par qāyam hō, aur tumhārā harīf nāhanjār shikshtyāb hō aur nīchā dekhe, ityādi !

Translation —

"O human beings, may your weapons i.e. fire-arms like cannon, guns etc. be strong and victorious as a result of My Grace and Mercy; may your wicked enemies be defeated and may you be victorious; may you be strong and powerful and may you perform great deeds; may you subdue the armies of the enemies, humiliate them and make them turn back and retrace their steps; may your army show valour and bravery and may it attain fame so that your rule may be established over the whole world and your unlucky enemies be defeated and dishonoured !"

This leaves no room now for any argument, for God Himself is promising His blessings.

112. Then arises the question, 'What need was there for God to reveal the *Vedas*?' Man could have gradually increased his knowledge and ultimately written books also. The reply that has been given is as follows :—

ھرگز نہیں بنا سکتے کیونکہ علت کے بغیر معلول کا پیدا
ھونا ناممکن ھے - جس طرح جنگلی آدمی کائنات کو دیکھ کر بھی
عالم نہیں ھوتے اور جب اُن کو کوئی سکھلانے والا مل جاوے تو
عالم ھو جاتے ھیں -........جب تک ملک آریہ ورت سے تعلیم
نہیں گئی تھی تب تک مصر - یونان - یورپ وغیرہ ممالک کے
باشندوں کو ذرا بھی علم نہیں ھوا تھا اور یورپ کے کولمبس
وغیرہ لوگ جب تک امریکہ میں نہیں گئے تھے تب تک وہ بھی

ھزاروں بلکہ لاکھوں - کروڑوں برسوں سے جاھل یعنی علم سے
بےبہرہ تھے - (ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۱۳۵)

"Hargiz nahīn banā sakte, kyōnki illat ke baghair ma'alūl kā paidā hōnā nāmumkin hai. Jis tarah janglī ādmī kāenāt kō dekh kar bhī ālim nahīn hōte aur jab unkō kōī sikhlāne wālā mil jāve tō ālim hō jāte hain............Jab tak mulk Aryāvart se tālīm nahīn gayee thī tab tak Misr, Unān, Europe vagairah mumālik ke bāshindōn kō zarā bhī 'ilm nahīn huā thā. Aur Europe ke Columbus vagairah lōg jab tak America men nahīn gaye the tab tak voh bhī hazārōn balki lākhōn karōṛōn barsōn se jāhil yānī 'ilm se bebahrā the."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 135)

Translation —

They would never have been able to write books because it is impossible to have an effect without cause. Just as uncivilized people even on seeing the entire creation do not become learned, but they become so only when they get some one to teach them. Further, as long as knowledge had not spread from India to Egypt, Greece and Europe, the inhabitants of those countries had no knowledge and as long as Columbus and others had not gone from Europe to America, people there had remained ignorant and without any education or learning for millions of years.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 135).

113. Of course, it is an admitted fact that man stands in great need of external help for making progress and becoming civilized, but the question is whether this need of humanity was fulfilled by revelation of the *Vedas* to mankind or by the advent of Gifted Personalities in the world? It should be noted that for the revelation of the *Vedas* also in the world the advent of the first four *Rishis* was necessary and if those holy men had not been born, how could the *Vedas* have been revealed? And this is

not all. In addition to those *Rishis*, other *Rishis* also were required to whom the meanings of the *Vedas* could be revealed. Do not these facts prove that mere divine knowledge or books of divine knowledge could not satisfy the needs of humanity for knowledge and guidance, and for this the advent of such perfect human beings as could absorb or imbibe this knowledge within themselves and then communicate it to others was essential ? You may refer to the conditions in the present times also. The Sacred *Vedas* are there and the entire world is anxious to know the correct meanings of the *Vedas* but the *Vedas* are quite silent[1] and do not help at all. And if the Saints mercifully explain the teachings of God in simple words, those who worship the *Vedas* laugh at them.

Besides, when in accordance with the above statement the ignorance of America was removed through Columbus after millions of years (and Columbus was unacquainted with the *Vedas*), did God remain indifferent towards America for such a long time and did the *Vedas* which then existed in the world remain unconcerned about those uncivilized people living in far-off lands ? And further, are modern scientific discoveries being made by those who know, understand and believe in the *Vedas* or by the people of Europe and America who made these discoveries step by step ofter studying the working of the creation though they are absolutely unacquainted with the *Vedas* and are indifferent to them ?

114. Then the question has been raised 'How the meaning of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed to the world, for the language in which the *Vedas* were themselves revealed was not understood by *Rishis* to whom the *Vedas* were revealed ?' And the reply that has been given is that

1. Not only this, the Vedas had left India and had gone to stay in Europe and it was with great difficulty that they were brought from Germany.

just as the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed to special *Rishis*, the meanings of those *mantras* were also revealed to other special *Rishis*.

دھرماتما یوگی مہرشی لوگ جب جب جس منتر کے معنی
جاننے کی خواهش سے توجه کو یکسو کرکے پرمیشور کی هستی میں
سمادھی کے اندر قائم هوے تب تب پرماتما نے مطلوب منتروں
کے معنی جتلائے - جب بہت لوگوں کے آتماؤں میں وید کے معنی
ظاهر هوئے تب رشی منیوں نے وہ معنی مع رشی منیوں کی
روایات کے کتابوں میں لکھے - ان کا نام براهمن هوا یعنی برهم جو
بمعنی وید هے اس کی شرح هونے کے باعث براهمن نام رکھا گیا -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحه ۲۳۶)

"Dharmātmā, Yōgī, Maharshi lōg jab jab jis mantra ke mānī jānne kī khwāhish se tavajjuh kō yaksū karke Parmeshwar kī hastī men samādhi ke andar qāyam hue, tab tab Parmātmā ne matlūb mantrōn ke mānī jatlāye. Jab bahut lōgōn kī atmāōn men Veda ke mānī zāhir hue tab Rishi Muniōn ne voh mānī maye Rishi Muniyōn kī ravāyāt ke kitābōn men likhe. Unkā nām Brāhmaṇa huā yānī Brahma jō bamānī Veda hai uskī sharah hōne ke bāyas Brāhmaṇa nām rakkhā gayā."

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 236)

Translation —

Whenever religious-minded *Yogis* and *Maharshis* with the desire of knowing the meaning of particular *mantras* concentrated their attention, engaged in *Samadhi* and fixed attention in God, God then revealed to them the meanings of those particular *mantras*. When the meanings of the *Vedas* were thus revealed to many persons, the *Rishis* and *Munis* wrote those meanings along with stories and anecdotes about those *Rishis* and *Munis* and these books were named *Brahmanas* because these books being the commentary on Brahma i.e. the *Vedas*, were called *Brahmanas*.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 236).

But it is strange that God revealed the *mantras* of the *Vedas* to those four *Rishis* who were holiest of all the *Jivas* but did not reveal the meaning to them. Why did He make this differentiation ? Was it because God considered the holiest *Rishis* as competent to receive and retain the *mantras* only and less holier *Rishis* as competent to receive and retain their meanings ? Moreover, it is not understood why objection is raised against acceptance of the *Brahmanas* as *Vedas* when the *Brahmanas* contain only those very meanings which God revealed to the *Rishis*. Are the *mantras* only the *Vedas* and are their meanings not the *Vedas* ? If it is so, *Rishi* Kautsa and the followers of Sanatan Dharma who believe that one can get the real benefit of the *Vedas* only by reciting the *mantras* correctly should be considered as being in the right and those who bother about the meanings of the *mantras* as being in the wrong.

115. But the questions do not finish with the above and a few more questions arise. For example, Swami Dayanand says that God did not reveal the *Vedas* in any of the languages prevalent in the country because in that case He would have been considered partial[1] but when it is admitted that God revealed the knowledge of the *Vedas* (i.e. their meanings) in the language used by *Rishis* concerned, was this action of His free from partiality ? It is strange reasoning that God would have been considered partial if He had revealed the original *mantras* in any language spoken at the time, and that He did not become partial in revealing the meanings of those *mantras* in the language of those *Rishis*. Further, if the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are not accepted as the *Vedas*, it would not be proper to call the *mantras* as *Vedas* for the word '*Vedas*' means knowledge and not mere *mantras* or words. And if both

1. But the world would have taken this as mercy ! God in His mercy is pleased to grant knowledge to the world but then revealing it in a language with which none is acquainted is nothing but a sort of a game of hide-and-seek.

the *mantras* and their meanings are to be accepted as the *Vedas*, the *Brahmanas* which admittedly contain the commentary on the *mantras* of the *Vedas* should be accepted as the *Vedas* and in that case the commentary of *Sayana* which has been written on the basis of *Śatapatha* and other *Brahmanas* should also be considered as authentic as the commentary of Swami Dayanand himself and nobody has the right to say that the commentary of Swami Dayanand has been prepared on the authority of the *Rishis* from Brahma to Jaimini etc. and the commentaries of others are absolutely incorrect.

EXAMPLES OF SWAMI DAYANAND'S REASONING

XVII

PRATYAKSHA PRAMĀNAS REGARDING THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

116. It would appear necessary that before the close of the discussion on the subject a few more examples of the reasoning of Swami Dayanand be given, so that the difficulties and perplexities of Satsangis could be fully appreciated. In *Samullas* 7 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, the subject of the 'Existence of God' and the 'Attributes of God' has been discussed thoroughly. As there is no other way of adequately examining the depth of religious research and high spiritual attainments of any person than to discuss this subject in detail, the subject matter of *Samullas* 7 is placed before the reader with great clarity. The following questions and answers are recorded on page 204 of the 4th Urdu Edition of Satyārtha Prakāśa.

117.

سوال—آپ ایشور ایشور کہتے ھیں لیکن اسکو ثابت کس طرح کرتے ھیں؟

جواب — سب پرتیکش وغیرہ پرمانوں (ثبوتوں) سے -

"Savāl—Āp Īśvar Īśvar kahte hain, lekin us kō sābit kis tarah karte hain?

Javāb—Sab pratyaksha vagairah pramāṇōn (sabūtōn) se."

Translation —

Question—You often speak about the existence of God in the creation, but how do you establish His existence?

Answer—With the help of '*pratyakṣha*' and other *pramanas*.

The subject matter is quite good and the answer is extremely bold, for it is not everybody who can have the courage to give '*pratyakṣha pramana*'. The reason is that the meaning of the words '*pratyakṣha pramana*' is the *pramana* or proof which man obtains with the help of his external senses, i.e. by the use of his eyes, ears, nose, etc. For example, somebody tells you that he has a precious diamond. You ask for proof and the man takes out the diamond from his pocket and puts it on the palm of your hand. It will then be admitted that the person has given '*pratyakṣha pramana*' of his having the diamond in his possession. And if there is a person who had a vision of God, i.e. he had seen God with his own eyes, and on meeting you, he tells you that there is God and when you ask for proof, he says only that he had seen God with his own eyes, this statement of his will not be '*pratyakṣha pramana*' for you, but will only be '*Śabda pramana*'. Admitted that, as he had seen God, he naturally has '*pratyakṣha jnana*' or direct knowledge of God, but when he talks to you on the basis of this direct-knowledge of his, he provides you with only a '*śabda pramana*', for

he makes you listen only to his words and you do not have any experience yourself of the existence of God. According to the first example, it would be '*pratyakṣha pramana*' for you only when he makes it possible for you to have perception of God through your external senses i.e. eyes, ears, nose, etc. It is thus evident that under these circumstances, one takes upon himself a heavy responsibility if he says he would give '*pratyakṣha pramana*' regarding the existence of God. But Swami Dayanand gladly accepted this responsibility for himself and promised to give '*pratyakṣha*' and other *pramanas*. And in order further to show the strength of his belief as well as the depth of his learning, he assumed the role of a critic and raised another question after giving the above reply.

118.

سوال—ایشور کي ذات میں پرتیکش وغیرہ ثبوت کبھی کام نہیں دے سکتے -

Savāl—Īśvar kī zāt men pratyaksha vagairah sabūt kabhī kām nahīn de sakte?"

Translation —

Question—As regards the existence of God, no '*pratyakṣha pramana*' or direct proof can serve the purpose.

This question clearly shows that Swami Dayanand knew well enough that people believe that direct or *pratyakṣha pramana* regarding the existence of God cannot be given, because, as has been stated in a song of the Arya Samajists,

ھر جگہ موجود ھے پر وہ نظر آتا نہیں -
یوگ سادھن کے بنا اس کو کوئی پاتا نہیں -

"Har jagah maujūd hai par voh nazar ātā nahīn,
Yōga-sādhan ke binā uskō kōyī pātā nahīn.

Translation —

God is present everywhere, but is not visible.

Nobody can attain Him without performing the practice of *Yoga.*

God is beyond the reach of the five senses of man and according to the statement of the Taittirīya Upanishad[1] :—

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह

"Yatō vāchō nivartante aprāpya mansā saha".

Translation—

Where the tongue fails to describe and the man's mind fails to grasp,

i.e. neither the tongue can describe God nor can man's mind reach Him. Further, according to the following *Sutra* of the Vaiśeshika Darśana[2]:—

तत्रात्मा मनश्चाप्रत्यक्षे (८-१-२)

Tatarātmā manaśchāpratyakshe. (8—1—2)

Translation—

Even the spirit and the mind are both *apratyakṣha.*[3]

It is imposible for man's senses to perceive the spirit and the mind directly and according to the following *Sutra* of the Sāmkhya Darśana[4]:—

ईश्वरासिद्धेः। (१—९२)

Īśvarāsiddheḥ. (1—92)

Translation—

Existence of God cannot be established,

i.e. God's existence cannot be established by means of reasoning.

---

1. Taittirīya Upanishad pertains to the Kṛishna Yajur-Veda. 2. Vaiśeshika Darśana is one of the 6 Darśanas (Systems of Indian philosophy). 3. i.e. beyond the sphere of the external senses. 4. Vide Note 1 on page 110.

119. But Swami Dayanand begins to answer the question without any hesitation and records three *Pratyakṣha Pramanas*, one after the other, and in order to keep the position quite clear, he first of all presents a *Sutra* from the Nyāya Darśana, which is an authoritative book of Hindu Logic and is the work of Sage Gautam, so that the critic may know that the *Pratyakṣha Pramanas* which he would give would be in accordance with the definition of such *pramanas* given in the *Nyaya Śastra*. Let us now look to the language of the answer:—

Answer—

इन्द्रियार्थ सन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमव्यपदेश्यमव्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम् ।

Indriyārtha sannikarshōtpannam jñānamavyapadeśyama vyabhichāri vyavasāyātmakam pratyaksham. (Nyāya. 1—4)

(یہ سوتر نیاے درشن مصنفہ مہرشی گوتم کا ھے -)

کان - جلد - آنکھ - زبان - ناک اور من (جوھر دراکہ) کا تعلق آواز - لمس - صورت - ذایقہ - بو - سکھ دکھ - سچ جھوٹھ وغیرہ محسوسات سے تعلق ھونے پر جو علم ھوتا ھے اُس کو پرتیکش کہتے ھیں بشرطیکہ وہ شکوک سے خالی ھو- (نیاے ۱-۴)

اب جائے غور ھے کہ حواس اور من کے ذریعہ صفتوں کا پرتیکش (عین الیقین) ھوا کرتا ھے نہ کہ موصوف کا - جس طرح چاروں حواس جلد وغیرہ کے ذریعہ سے لمس - صورت - ذایقہ اور بو (یعنی صفات ارضی) کا علم ھونے پر اس کے موصوف پرتھوی (یعنی ارض) کا پرتیکش من معہ آتما کے ذریعہ ھوتا ھے اُسی طرح اس پرتیکش دنیا میں خاص صنعت و حکمت وغیرہ صفات کے پرتیکش ھونے سے ایشور بھی پرتیکش ھے -

(ب) دل کی حالت سے ایشور کی ھستی کا ثبوت

نیز جب آتما من کو اور من حواس کو کسی شے محسوسہ میں لگاتا ھے یا جس لمحہ میں آتما چوری وغیرہ برے یا رفاہ عام وغیرہ اچھے کام کرنا شروع کرتا ھے تو جیو کی خواھش اور علم

وغیرہ چونکہ اُس وقت اُسی خواھش کی ھوئی چیز کی طرف جھک جاتے ھیں اس لئے اس لمحہ میں جو آتما کے اندر برے کام کے کرنے میں خوف - تامل اور شرم اور اچھے کاموں کے کرنے میں بیخوفی- عدم تامل - خوشی اور حوصلہ پیدا ھوتا ھے وہ جیوآتما کی طرف سے نہیں بلکہ پرماتما کی طرف سے ھے -

(ج) مراقبہ کی حالت میں پرمیشور کا پرتیکش

اور جب جیو آتما شدھ (صاف طبع) ھو کر پرماتما کی نسبت دل سے غور کرتا ھے تو اس وقت اس کو دونوں کا 'پرتیکش' (علم بالمشافہ) ھوتا ھے - نظر بریں جبکہ پرمیشور 'پرتیکش' ھے تو انومان (ثبوت قیاسی) وغیرہ سے پرمیشور کا علم ھونے میں کیا شک ھو سکتا ھے - کیونکہ معلول کو دیکھ کر علت کا قیاس لازمی ھے -

(Yeh Sūtra Nyāya Darśana musannifā Maharshi Gautam kā hai).

(a) Kān, jild, ānkh, zabān, nāk aur mana (jauhar darrākah) kā ta'aluq āvāz, lams, sūrat, zāeqah, bū, sukh dukh, sach jhūṭh vagairah mahsūsāt se ta'aluq hōne par jō 'ilm hōtā hai, uskō pratyaksha kahte hain, basharteki voh shaqūq se khālī hō.

... ... (Nyāya 1—4).

Ab jāe ghaur hai ke havās aur mana ke zariye sifatōn kā pratyaksha (ain-ul-yaqin) huā kartā hai na ke mausūf kā. Jis tarah chārōn havās jild vagairah ke zariye se lams, sūrat, zāeqah aur bū (yānī sifāt-i-arazi) kā 'ilm hōne par us ke mausūf prithivī (yānī arz) kā pratyaksha mana maye ātmā ke zariye hōtā hai, usī tarah is pratyaksha duniyā men khās san'at va hikamat vagairah sifāt ke pratyaksha hōne se Īśvara bhī pratyaksha hai.

(b) DIL KĪ HĀLAT SE ĪŚVARA KĪ HASTĪ KĀ SABŪT

Nīz jab ātmā mana kō aur mana havās kō kisī shai mahsūsā men lagātā hai yā jis lamhā men ātmā chōrī vagairah bure yā rafāh-i-'ām vagairah achchhe kām karnā shurū kartā hai tō jīva kī khwāhish aur 'ilm vagairah chūnki us vaqt usī khwāhish kī huyee chīz kī taraf jhuk jāte hain—is liye us lamhā men jō ātmā ke andar bure kām ke karne men khauf ta'ammul

aur sharam aur achchhe kāmōn ke karne men bekhaufī adam ta'ammul, khushī aur hauslā paidā hōtā hai voh jīvātmā kī taraf se nahīn balke Paramātmā kī taraf se hai.

(c) MURĀQABAH KĪ HĀLAT MEN PARMESHWAR KĀ PRATYAKSHA

Aur jab jīvātmā śuddh (sāf tabā) hō kar Parmātmā kī nisbat dil se ghaur kartā hai tō us vaqt uskō dōnōn kā 'pratyaksha' (ilm bilmasāfah) hōtā hai. Nazar-barīn jabke Parmeshwar 'pratyaksha' hai, tō anumān (sabūt qayāsī) vagairah se Parmeshwar kā 'ilm hōne men kyā shak hō saktā hai kyōnke mālul kō dekh kar illat kā qayās lāzimī hai."

Translation—

(This Sutra is from the *Nyaya Darśana* of Sage Gautam). Whatever knowledge is achieved by the ears, skin, eyes, tongue, nose and mind as a result of their connection with sound, touch, form, taste, smell, happiness and unhappiness, truth and falsehood etc. is known as *Pratyaksha jnana* i.e. direct knowledge provided it is free from doubts and uncertainties.

(Nyaya 1—4)

It should be noted that by means of the senses and the mind one can have direct knowledge of the attributes only and not of the possessor of the attributes just as the four knowledge-senses i.e. skin etc. obtain direct knowledge of touch, form, taste and smell i.e. of the attributes of physical objects and thereby the direct knowledge of the physical world through the spirit in association with mind, in the same manner in this directly-perceived world, God is directly perceived through direct perception of His special attributes, e.g. skill and wisdom manifest in the creation.

(b) PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD FROM THE CONDITION OF MAN'S MIND

When the spirit applies the mind and the mind

applies the senses to any desired object or perceived at the moment when the spirit begins to commit some bad act, e.g. theft etc. or to perform some good act e.g. any act for the good of the public etc., then as man's desire and knowledge etc. lean towards the desired object, therefore fear, delay and shame which one feels at that moment in doing bad acts or fearlessness, lack of hesitation, happiness and courage which one feels in doing good acts come from God and not from the spirit.

(c) DIRECT PERCEPTION OF GOD IN THE CONDITION OF SAMADHI

And when the spirit after being perfectly purified begins to apply itself to God, it gets direct preception of both.

From this point of view, if God is directly perceivable, there can be no doubt regarding the possibility of having the knowledge of God by means of other proofs, e.g. Anumāna Pramaṇa etc., because from action or effect one can always find out the cause for the act.

120. It can be definitely concluded from a perusal o the above that, according to Swami Dayanand, God can b directly perceived in the world and therefore in proof o His existence all kinds of proofs, e.g. *Pratyakṣha*, *Anuman* and *Śabda Pramana* etc. can be given but he content himself with giving only three direct proofs because othe kinds of proofs have no value in comparison to Pratyaksh pramāṇa or direct proof. Let us therefore first examin his definition of 'Pratyaksha Premāṇa' because it is strange definition and there are many words in thi definition for which there is no original word or synonyn in the original *Sutra* of Nyāya Darśana.

121. It is a matter for consideration that the word

of the Nyāya-Sūtra इन्द्रियार्थ सन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानम् "Indriyārtha sannikarshotapannam jñānam" have been given in the sense of 'knowledge gained from contact of the senses with the objects perceived', but Swami Dayanand, while explaining these words, has after writing the names of the knowledg-senses, i.e. ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose, has added 'Man (Jauhar Darrākah)" and after referring to the properties pertaining to these senses, viz, sound, touch, form, taste and smell has also added the words 'happiness and unhappiness', 'truth and falsehood'. Is it not extremely wrong to consider 'happiness and unhappiness', 'truth and falsehood' along with the properties of the five senses, e.g. touch, form, etc. which are the properties of the physical objects of the world also? Of course, it is true the appearance of a particular object or its conception gives experience of 'happiness or unhappiness' to man's mind and by using his power of discrimination he obtains knowledge of 'truth and falsehood', but it is absolutely wrong to consider that just as our eye, nose, ear, etc. obtain the knowledge of form, smell, sound, etc., in the same manner our mind[1] also obtains knowledge of 'happiness and unhappiness' and 'truth and falsehood'. Are 'happiness and unhappiness' and 'truth and falsehood' the qualities of any object of the world, of which the mind of man obtains direct knowledge by bringing some faculty of its own into contact with those objects, just as knowledge-senses by establishing contact with the physical objects and the physical properties of sound, touch, form, taste and smell, obtain knowledge about them? No, never. You may just go through the pages of *Samullas* 3 of Satyārtha Prakāśa and see what Swami Dayanand states there. While explaining the '*Pratyaksha-pramana*' the same *Sutra* of *Nyaya Darśana*

---

1. It has been proved in Chapter 10, Āhnika 1 of the Vaiśeshika Darśana that ths causes of happiness and unhappiness etc. are Rāga (Love) and Dvesha (Hatred) of man's mind and that happiness and unhappiness are not merely conditions of knowledge.

has been referred to and the following translation of the *Sutra* is given :—

اندریہ اور ارتھ کے ملاپ سے جو گیان خالی از ویپدیش - خالی
از ویبھچار نشچیاتمک ہو - اسکو پرتییکش کہتے ہیں -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن صفحہ ٦١)

"Indriya aur arth ke milāp se jō jnāna khālī az vyapadeśa, khālī az vyabhichār, niśchayātmak hō uskō pratyaksha kahte hain."
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 61).

Translation—

Knowledge which is attained by the contact of the senses with the objects perceived and which is unalterable, unadulterated and definite is known as *Pratyakṣha* i.e. direct knowledge.
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 61).

And this meaning is further explained as below :—

کان - چمڑا - آنکھ - زبان ناک کا براہ راست تعلق جب
آواز- لمس - شکل - ذایقہ اور بو کے ساتھ ہو اور من (جوہردرا کہ)
کا حواس کے ساتھ اور آتما کا من کے ساتھ - تو ایسے تعلق سے جو
گیان پیدا ہوتا ہے اس کو پرتییکش کہتے ہیں -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ٦١)

"Kān, chamṛā, ānkh, zabān, nāk kā barāhe rāst ta'aluq jab āvaz, lams, shaql, zāyeqā aur bū ke sāth hō aur man (jauhre-darrākah) kā havās ke sāth aur ātmā kā man ke sāth, tō aise ta'aluk se jō jñāna paidā hōtā hai uskō pratyaksha (badīhī) kahte hain." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 61)

Translation —

When direct contact of ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose is established with sound, touch, form, taste and smell and of mind with the senses, and of spirit with the mind, the knowledge that is obtained by means of these contacts is called *Pratyakṣha* i.e. direct knowledge.
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 61)

This explanation of the meaning of the *Sutra* is quite correct and the ancient commentators[1] also give this meaning. But it should first be noted that in this explanation, mind has not been included in the knowledge-senses, secondly that there has been no mention of 'happiness and unhappiness', 'truth and falsehood' among the objects of contact by the senses, though of course, the condition that at the time when knowledge is being obtained, the mind must be in contact with the senses and the spirit must be in contact with the mind, which is proper and reasonable in every way, and thirdly, the condition has been imposed that the senses should have direct contact with the objects perceived by the senses. Is there not quite obvious difference between this explanation of the *Nyaya Sutra* and the explantion which has been given in *Samullas* 7 of the Satyārtha Prakāśa which is under discussion ? It becomes quite clear that Swami Dayanand in order to define '*pratyaksha jnana*' i.e. direct knowledge has referred to the authority of the *Nyaya Sutra* of Sage *Gautam*, but while explaining it, he has included knowledge of 'happiness and unhappiness' and 'truth and falsehood' under direct knowledge by including man's mind in the five senses which was quite improper. Any way, let us now see how this definition has been applied.

122. Swami ji writes :—

اب جائے غور ہے کہ حواس اور من کے ذریعہ صفتوں کا
پرتیکش (عین الیقین) ہوا کرتا ہے - نہ کہ موصوف کا - جس طرح
چاروں حواس جلد وغیرہ کے ذریعہ سے لمس - صورت - ذایقہ اور
بو (یعنی صفات ارضی) کا علم ہونے پر اس کے موصوف پرتھوی
(یعنی ارض) کا پرتیکش من معہ آتما کے ذریعہ ہوتا ہے -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۲۰۵)

---

1. In this connection, please refer to the commentary of Sage Vatsyāyana authority of which has been quoted by Swami Dayanand himself in the First Edition of Satyārtha Prakāśa.

"Ab jāye ghaur hai ke havās aur man ke zariye sifatōn kā pratyaksha (ain-ul-yaqīn) huā kartā hai na ke mausūf kā, jis tarah chārōn havās, jild vagairah ke zariye se lams, sūrat, zāyeqā aur bū (yānī sifāt arzī) ka 'ilm hōne par us ke mausūf pṛithvī (yānī arz) kā pratyaksha man maye ātmā ke zariye hōtā hai." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 205).

Translation—

It should be noted that one can have direct knowledge, through the senses and the mind, of the attributes and not of the possessor of the attributes, just as by means of the four senses, viz, skin, etc., direct knowledge of touch, form, taste and smell (i.e. the physical attributes) is obtained, but the idea about the possessor of those attributes, i.e. the physical world itself, is formed by the spirit in association with the mind.

Obviously, this statement of his is quite correct, but it should also have been remembered that by means of the senses and the mind an ordinary man can at the most have knowledge or perception of only the attributes of God. But alas ! Swami Dayanand draws quite a different inference from this example ! He says :—

اسي طرح اس پرتیکش دنیا میں خاص صنعت و حکمت
وغیرہ صفات کے پرتیکش ہونے سے ایشور بھی پرتیکش ہے -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۲۰۵)

Usī tarah is pratyaksha duniyā men khās san'at va hikamat vagairah sifāt ke pratyaksha hōne se Īśvara bhī pratyaksha hai. (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 205).

Translation —

In the same manner a particular kind of skill and wisdom are directly observed in this visible world and from these the existence of God is inferred.
(Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 205)

At first, it had been proved from the example of the

physical world, that by means of the senses and the mind, one can have knowledge only of the qualities and not of the possessor of the qualities, but immediately afterwards, i.e. in the next sentence an inference quite opposite to the above has been drawn that, as by means of the senses and the mind, direct knowledge of the special qualities of God, i.e. of His skill and wisdom is obtained, man can have direct knowledge of God also[1]. O good sir, first of all, everybody cannot have direct knowledge of the skill and wisdom, for one needs special training for observing and understanding the skill and wisdom of God. And secondly, are the scientists of the West and experts of Geology, Biology, Physiology, Astronomy, etc. blind, as they are not able to see the skill and wisdom of God in the objects of nature? And if they are able to see and observe the skill and wisdom of God, why do they not have direct knowledge of God as a result of observation of the skill and wisdom of God and why do they openly and boldly deny the existence of God? It would really be strange that ordinary human beings should be able to observe the skill and wisdom of God in nature and obtain direct knowledge of God but people who are experts in arts and sciences should remain deprived of this knowledge!

123. But the matter does not end here. The translator of the Satyārtha Prakāsa (4th Urdu Edition) having realized the weakness of the arguments of Swami Dayanand, comes to his aid and in this connection writes a very long footnote under the above sentence. The note is as follows:—

اسی امر کے متعلق سانکھ درشن میں بھی بحث آئی ہے جوکہ
سوتر نمبر۸۷ ادھیاے اول سے شروع ہوتی ہے- وہاں سوتر نمبر۸۹
میں پرتیکش کی اسہی تعریف (کہ من سے حواس کا اور حواس کا
محسوسات سے تعلق ہونے پر جو علم ہوتا ہے اسے پرتیکش کہتے

---

1. This is high-handedness No. 2. For high-handedness No. 1, see paragraph No. 121.

ہیں) سوتر نمبر ۹۰-۹۱ میں اس کی کمی کو یہ کہہ کر پورا کیا ہے کہ
یہ محض بیرونی حواس کے ذریعہ ہونے والے پرتیکش کی تعریف ہے۔
یوگیوں کو اندرونی حواس یعنی من کے ذریعہ بھی پرتیکش ہوتا
ہے۔ اسی امر کو اس جگہ رشی دیانند نے نیائے درشن کے اس سوتر
کی تفسیر کرتے ہوئے جتایا ہے کہ جس طرح کان اور آنکھ وغیرہ
معہ من کا تعلق آواز اور شکل سے ہونے پر جو بلاشک و شبہ علم
ہو اسے پرتیکش کہتے ہیں۔ اسی طرح محض من کا تعلق سکھ دکھ
سچ جھوٹھ سے ہونے پر جو علم ہوتا ہے اسے بھی پرتیکش کہتے
ہیں۔ اس دلیل کے پہلے حصے کی مثال زمین کے علم سے دیتے ہوئے
دوسرے حصے کو یعنی محض من کے ذریعہ حاصل شدہ علم کے
پرتیکش ہونے کو پرمیشور کے صفات صنعت و حکمت کے ذریعہ
پرمیشور کا پرتیکش ہونے کے لئے بطور تمثیل کے پیش کیا ہے۔
کیونکہ صنعت و حکمت کے اثرات گو حواس بیرونی سے محسوس
ہو سکتے ہیں مگر صنعت و حکمت بذات خود محض من سے ہی
معلوم ہو سکتے ہیں۔ گویا یہاں یہ بتلایا گیا ہے کہ پرتیکش اس
طرح کا ہوتا ہے۔ بذریعہ حواس بیرونی و بذریعہ حواس اندرونی
اور کہ سانکھیہ درشن میں جس پرتیکش کا عدم تسلیم کیا گیا ہے
وہ پرتیکش بذریعہ حواس بیرونی کا ہے۔ جس کو یہاں بھی تسلیم
نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔

(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۲۰۵)

"Isī amar ke muta'aliq Sāmkhya Darśana men bhī bahas āyee hai jō ki Sūtra nambar 87 Adhyāya avval se śurū hōtī hai. Vahān Sūtra nambar 89 men pratyaksha kī ismī tārīf (ke mana se havās kā aur havās kā mahsūsāt se ta'alluq hōne par jō 'ilm hōtā hai use pratyaksha kahte hain) Sūtra No. 90-91 men iskī kamī kō yeh kah kar pūrā kiyā hai ke yeh mahaz berūnī havās ke zariye hōne vāle pratyaksha kī tārīf hai. Yōgiyōn kō andrūnī havās yānī man ke zariye bhī pratyaksha hōtā hai. Isī amar kō is jagah Rishi Dayanand ne Nyāya Darśana ke is Sūtra kī tafsīr karte hue jatāyā hai ke jis tarah kān aur ānkh vagairah maye man kā ta'aluq āvāz aur śaql se hōne par jō bilā shak va shubah 'ilm hō use pratyaksha kahte hain. Isī tarah mahaz man kā ta'aluq sukh dukh, sach, jhūṭh se hōne par jō 'ilm hōtā hai use bhī pratyaksha kahte hain. Is dalīl ke pahle hisse kī misāl zamīn ke 'ilm se dete huye dūsre hisse kō yānī mahaz man ke zariye hāsilshudā

(prāpt kiye huye) 'ilm ke pratyaksha hōne kō Parmeśvar ke sifāt san'at va hikmat ke zariye Parmeśvar kā pratyaksha hōne ke liye bataur tamsīl ke pesh kiyā hai, kyōnki san'at va hikmat ke asrāt gō havās berūnī se mahsūs hō sakte hain magar san'at va hikmat bazāte khud mahaz man se hī mālūm hō sakte hain. Gōyā yahān yeh batlāyā gayā hai ki pratyaksha us tarah kā hōtā hai, bazariye havās berūnī va bazariye havās andrūnī aur ki Sāmkhya Darśana men jis pratyaksha kā adam taslīm kiyā gayā hai voh pratyaksha bazariye havās berūnī kā hai, jis kō yahān bhī taslīm nahīn kiyā gayā hai." (Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edi. P. 205)

Translation —

This subject has been discussed in Sāmkhya Darśana as well. The discussion there begins with Chapter I *Sutra* 87. The definition of the word '*pratyaksha*' is that 'when contact of the mind is established with the senses and of the senses with the objects perceived, the knowledge that is obtained is said to be '*pratyaksha*'. In *Sutras* 90 and 91, effort has been made to make up the deficiency of this definition by stating that this definition pertains only to that '*pratyaksha*' which is the result of knowledge gained through external senses. The *Yogis* obtain '*pratyaksha*' i.e. direct knowledge also through internal senses, i.e. the mind. This very fact has been stated by Rishi Dayanand while commenting on this *Sutra* of *Nyaya Darśana* that as the ear and the eye etc. along with mind form contact with sound and form etc. and obtain knowledge which may be definite or certain, i.e. without any doubts, that knowledge is known as '*pratyaksha*'. In the same manner, the knowledge that one gets when contact of the mind only is established with conditions of 'happiness and unhappiness', 'truth and falsehood', is also known as '*pratyaksha*'. The illustration given in the first part of this argument which pertains to the knowledge of the world has been given as an example for the second part of the argument which is that 'the knowledge

which is obtained by mind alone about the qualities, i.e. skill, wisdom etc. of God is knowledge about God Himself, for though the facts of the skill and wisdom of God can be experienced by external senses but the skill and wisdom in themselves can be appreciated only by the mind.' In other words, it has been stated that '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge is obtained both by means of external senses as well as by means of internal senses and that the absence of direct knowledge which has been admitted in *Samkhya Darśana* is the '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge which is obtained by means of external senses and this has not been admitted here either.

(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 205)

124. The foot-note quoted above is nothing but a heap of new complications, but as the object is to arrive at the essence of the subject under discussion and also to obtain knowledge about the state of things, every word of this will be duly considered. It is a fact that there is mention of the subject under discussion in the *Samkhya Darśana* and the definition of '*pratyaksha*' *jnana* (i.e. direct knowledge) has been given in *Sutra* No. 89 and that definition is similar to the definition given by Sage Gautam. For convenience, first of all the original *Sutra* and then its translation are given :—

यत् सम्बद्धं सत् तदाकारोल्लेखि विज्ञानं तत् प्रत्यक्षम् । ८९

अनुवाद—सम्बद्ध होता हुआ (सम्बद्ध वस्तु के) आकार को धारण करने वाला जो विज्ञान (बुद्धिवृत्ति) होता है वह प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण है । ८९

Yat sambaddham sat tadākārōllekhi vijñānam tat pratyaksham. 89

Anuvād—Sambaddh hōtā huā (sambaddh vastu ke) ākār kō dhāraṇ karne vālā jō vijñāna (buddhivṛitti) hōtā hai voh pratyaksha pramāṇa hai.

Translation —

That knowledge (i.e. vṛitti of human intellect) which adopts the form of the object perceived on

contacting that object, is known as *'pratyakṣha' pramana*.

The translator of Satyārtha Prakāśa has invited special attention to *Sutras* 90 and 91. Those *Sutras* are also therefore given along with their meanings :—

योगिनामबाह्यप्रत्यक्षत्वान्न दोषः॥ ९०

लीनवस्तुलब्धातिशयसम्बन्धाद्वाऽदोषः॥ ९१

ترجمہ— یوگیوں کا پرتیکش اباهیہ (اندرونی) ہونے سے دوش نہیں ہے۔ ۹۰

دوسری کے لین (نکت نہیں یعنی جو وستوویں بیتی- آنے والی یا دور ہیں) ان میں پراپت جو (یوگ دوارا اتپن) اتیشے (अतिशय) یعنی ورتی کا پرتی بندھک (روکنے والا) جو تم (तम) اسکی نورتی آدی سے سمبندھ ہونے سے دوش نہیں ہے۔ ۹۱

Yōgināmabāhyapratyakshatvānna dōshaḥ. 90
Līnavastulabdhātiśayasambandhādvā adōshaḥ. 91

Yōgiyōn kā pratyaksha ābāhya (andarūnī) hōne se dōsh nahīn hai. 90

Dūsrī ke līn (nikaṭ nahīn yānī jō vastuen bītī, āne vālī yā dūr hain) un men prāpt jō (Yōga-dvārā utpann) atiśaya yānī vṛitti kā pratibandhak (rōkane vālā) jō tama us kī nivṛitti ādi se sambandh hōne se dōsh nahīn hai. 91

Translation —

As the perception or the direct knowledge of *Yogis* is internal, there can be no fault in it. 90

Or there is no fault in it because of being connected with that which removes the darkness, which prevents the *'vrittis'* of the mind from flowing, the capacity for removal of darkness from over any objects of the past or of the future or objects at a distance being obtained through *Yoga*.

125. The net result is that according to the *Samkya Darśana*, the *'pratyaksna jnana'* or direct knowledge is that knowledge or *buddhi-vritti* i.e. the *vritti* of human intellect

which takes the form of any object when contact is established with that object,. If in place of the words '*buddhi vritti*' or 'vritti of human intellect' we use the words 'attention current' (*tavajjuh ki dhar*), the meaning can easily be understood. In other words, when the current of our attention forms connection with any object of the world through some sense, then the knowledge which is obtained by the attention current taking the form of that object is known as '*pratyaksh jnana*' or direct knowledge. This is the meaning of *Sutra* 89 of Sage Kapil and there is no difference between this and the definition of '*pratyaksha jnana*' given by Sage Gautam. Both the Great Personalities say that '*pratyaksh jnana*' or direct knowledge is that knowledge which is obtained when man's intellect forms direct connection with the objects of the world through the senses. And the translator also says the same thing that "the definition of the word '*pratyaksha*' given there in *Sutra* 89 is that, when contact of the mind is established with the senses and of the senses with the objects perceived, the knowledge that is obtained is said to be '*pratyaksha*'.

126. Let us now look into the meaning of the remaining two *Sutras*. According to the definition of '*pratyaksha jnana*' that has been given in *Sutra* No. 89, only that knowledge can be said to be '*pratyaksha*' which is acquired through the senses. In regard to this, an objection can be raised that under these circumstances, the '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge of the *Yogis* which they acquire during '*samadhi*' could not be termed as '*pratyaksha jnana*' because the *Yogis*, while acquiring this knowledge, do not make any use of their external senses, e.g. eyes, nose, ears, etc. Sage Kapil answers this objection in *Sutra* No. 90 and says that here reference is only to external direct knowledge and the definition given here pertains to such knowledge only. The non-external i.e. internal knowledge of the *Yogis* is not the subject matter of this discussion, because it has no connection whatsoever with that knowledge which is obtained by ordinary human

beings through the five knowledge-senses. Obviously, this answer to their objection is quite correct. But in *Sutra* 91, the answer is given in much greater detail and it is stated that the knowledge that is attained during *Samadhi* is the knowledge of things hidden from sight or of distant things which is attained on the removal, by the internal *Śakti* awakened through the practice of *Yoga*, of that darkness which prevents the flow of attention current. Obviously, this knowledge has no connection whatsoever with that direct knowledge which is obtained through the senses and about which the definition is being fixed up.

127. By a critical examination of the meaning of these *Sutras* of Sāmkhya Darśana and by comparing their meaning with the meaning of the *Sutras* of *Nyaya Darśana*, everyone would draw the following three conclusions:—

First, that the author of Sāmkhya Darśana does not give up the definition of '*pratyaksha jnana*', which is given in *Sutra* No. 89, and while not rejecting the possibility of *Yogis* getting direct knowledge or '*pratyaksha jnana*' by means of faculties awakened through *Yoga* practices, he considers this '*pratyaksha jnana*' as a thing different from the '*pratyaksha jnana*' described in *Sutra* No. 89 of his *Darśana*. Secondly, that the author of Nyāya *Darśana*, Sage Gautam, while defining '*pratyaksha pramana*' and Sage Kapil, author of Sāmkhya *Darśana*, while describing the '*pratyaksha jnana*' emphasize that the '*pratyaksha pramana*' and *jnana* referred to by them pertain only to that knowledge which is obtained through external senses and thirdly, Sage Kapil does not deny that the knowledge obtained through the internal senses is also '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge, but he makes it clear that it is a quite different kind of experience and pertains only to the state of *Yoga* and to the internal senses. In the face of these clear and self-evident conclusions, it was not proper for the translator of the Satyārtha Prakāśa to attempt to give a different

interpretation to the position of Swami Dayanand in regard to '*pratyaksha pramana*'[1] and to produce in its support the authority of the Sāmkhya Darśana, though against the clear teachings of the Sāmkhya Darśana in this connection. Of course, it is admitted that, as has already been stated, the object of the translator in making such attempt was good, viz, that he wanted to remove the weakness of the argument of Swami Dayanand in connection with the *pratyaksha pramana*, but the result has been just the opposite, for on account of the authority of the Sāmkhya Darśana having come in between, it has become clear that the attempt of Swami Dayanand to give '*pratyaksha pramana*' with a view to establish the existence of God is opposed not only to the Nyāya Darśana, but also to the Sāmkhya Darśana.

128. Well, this change of position may be accepted, viz, that '*pratyaksha jnana*' includes that *jnana* or knowledge also which is obtained by *Yogis* with the help of their internal faculties which they awaken by means of their *Yoga* practices, but Swami Dayanand had promised to give such '*pratyaksha pramanas*' (direct proofs) of the existence of God as would be justifiable according to the Nyāya Darśana. How could he then rely on the '*pratyaksha pramanas*' which fall within the experience of *Yogis* only ? Did any *Yogi* ask from Swami Dayanand the question referred to above, viz, "You repeatedly refer to God, but how do you establish the existence of God ?" so that he gave his answer to it on the basis of the experiences of *Yogis* ?

129. We may now look into the competence of the translator. He writes :—

یوگیوں کو اندرونی حواس یعنی من کے ذریعہ بھی پرتیکش
گیان ہوتا ہے - اسی امر کو اس جگہ رشی دیانند نے نیاے درشن
کے اس سوتر کی تفسیر کرتے ہوئے جتایا ہے کہ جس طرح کان اور

1. This is high-handedness No. 3.

آنکھ وغیرہ معہ من کا تعلق آواز اور شکل سے ھونے پر جو
بلاشک و شبہ علم ھو اُسے پرتیکش کہتے ھیں - اسی طرح محض
من کا تعلق سکھ - دکھ - سچ جھوٹھ سے ھونے پر جو علم ھوتا ھے اُسے
بھی پرتیکش کہتے ھیں - اسی طرح محض من کا تعلق سکھ دکھ سچ
جھوٹھ سے ھونے پر جو علم ھوتا ھے اسے بھی پرتیکش کہتے ھیں -

"Yōgiyōn kō andarūnī havās yānī man ke zariye bhī pratyaksha jñāna hōtā hai. Isī amar kō is jagah Ṛishi Dayanand ne Nyāya Darśana ke is Sūtra kī tafsīr karte hue jatāyā hai ke jis tarah kān aur ānkh vagairah maye man kā ta'aluq āvāz aur śaql se hōne par jō bilā shak va shubah 'ilm hō use pratyaksha kahte hain, isī tarah mahaz man kā ta'aluq sukh dukh sach jhūṭh se hōne par jō 'ilm hōtā hai use bhī pratyaksha kahte hain.

Translaiton —

The *Yogis* obtain '*pratyakṣha*' i.e. direct knowledge through internal senses also, i.e. the mind. This very fact has been stated by *Rishi* Dayanand while commenting on this *Sutra* of Nyaya Darśana that as the ear and the eye etc. along with the mind form contact with sound and form etc. and obtain knowledge which may be definite or certain, i.e. without any doubts, that knowledge is known as '*pratyakṣha*'. In the same manner, the knowledge that one gets when only mind's contact is established with conditions of 'happiness and unhappiness', 'truth and falsehood', is also known as '*pratyakṣha*'.

If the meaning of the Sāmkhya Sūtra is accepted according to his interpretation, the only thing that is established is that the Sāmkhya *Darśana* permits the inclusion of that knowledge, which the *Yogis* obtain through the internal faculty which they awaken by means of *Yoga* practices, in '*pratyakṣha jnana*' or direct knowledge and not the experience of 'happiness and unhappiness' and 'truth and falsehood' which is obtained by ordinary people through their minds. Under these circumstances, how can it be established that "the

knowledge which is obtained when the mind forms its contact with the conditions of 'happiness and unhappiness' and 'truth and falsehood' is also '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge[1]". At the end of his foot-note, the translator writes : –

گویا یہاں یہ بتلایا گیا ھے کہ پرتیکش اس طرح کا ھوتا ھے - بذریعہ حواس بیرونی و بذریعہ حواس اندرونی اور کہ سانکھ درشن میں جس پرتیکش کا عدم تسلیم کیا گیا ھے وہ پرتیکش بذریعہ حواس بیرونی کا ھے جس کو یہاں بھی تسلیم نہیں کیا گیا ھے -

"Gōyā yahān yeh batlāyā gayā hai ki pratyaksha us tarah kā hōtā hai, bazariye havās berūnī va bazariye havās andrūnī aur ki Sāmkhya Darśana men jis pratyaksha kā adam taslīm kiyā gayā hai voh pratyaksha bazariye havās berūnī kā hai, jis kō yahān bhī taslīm nahīn kiyā gayā hai."

Translation —

In other words, it has been stated that '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge is obtained both by means of external senses as well as by means of internal senses and that the absence of direct knowledge which has been admitted in Sāmkhya Darśana is the '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge which is obtained by means of external senses and this '*pratyaksha*' has not been admitted here either.

Rest assured that Swami Dayanand had no such idea in mind. He presented a very simple (though worthless) argument on the basis that man directly sees in the world the skill and wisdom of God, i.e. just as man by observing the qualities pertaining to the physical world through his senses admits the existence of the physical world, similarly by observing the skill and wisdom of God in the creation, direct knowledge of God should be admitted.

---

1. This is high-handedness No. 4.

The knowledge obtained through *Yoga* practices which has been dragged in into the argument has been mentioned by Swami Dayanand in connection with the third '*pratyaksha pramana*' or direct proof. And just see what has been written in the last line of the foot-note under reference. If really Swami Dayanand did not accept '*pratyaksha jnana*' (direct knowledge) obtained through external senses as far as it relates to God, why did he then at all refer to the definition of '*pratyaksha pramana*' given in the Nyāya Darśana and why did he not refer to Sāmkhya Darśana, i. e. to the definition supplied by the translator ? Obviously, Swami Dayanand did not have in his mind those meanings of the *Sutras* of Śāmkhya Darśana which the translator now wants to introduce. This is evidently very unreasonable on the part of the translator.[1]

130. But the last sentence of the foot-note still needs some further clarification. The words of the translator, "the '*pratyaksha*', the absence of which has been accepted in the Sāmkhya Darśana," etc. cannot be understood by the readers because so far there has been no mention of that authority of Sāmkhya Darśana, which is referred to in the above words. And it is a matter of regret that the translator entirely forgot that this subject of Sāmkhya Darśana has been mentioned later on on page 217 of the Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition. Thus after quoting the following *Sutras* of the Sāmkhya Darsana, it has been alleged that, according to these *Sutras*, the Sāmkhya Darsana appears to support atheism. The *Sutras* are :—

ईश्वरासिद्धेः ।

प्रमाणाभावान्न तत्सिद्धिः ।

Iśvarāsiddheḥ.	1—92
Pramāṇābhāvānna tatsiddhiḥ.	5—10

1. This is high-handedness No. 5.

Translation—

Existence of God cannot be established. (1—92)

Because of the absence of any proof, existence of :od is not established. (5—10)

Swami Dayanand has translated these *Sutras* as below:—

ثبوت ایسے ایشور کا جس پر کہ 'پرتیکش' (ثبوت بذریعہ احساس) عاید کیا جا سکے - حاصل نہیں - (سانکھیہ درشن ۱—۹۲

کیونکہ جب اسکے ثبوت میں 'پرتیکش' (ثبوت بذریعہ احساس) نہیں تو انومان (قیاس) وغیرہ ثبوت بھی نہیں ہو سکتے - (سانکھیہ درشن ۵—۱۰) -
(ستیارتھ پرکاش - چوتھا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۲۱۷)

Sabūt aise Īśvara kā, jis par ke 'pratyaksha' (sabūt bazariye ahsās) āyad kiyā jā sake, hāsil nahīn (Sāmkhya Darśana, 1—92).

Kyōnki jab uske sabūt men 'pratyaksha' (sabūt bazariye ahsās), nahīn tō anumān (qayās) vagairah sabūt bhī nahīn hō sakte." (Sāmkhya Darśan, 5—10)
(Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 217)

Translation—

Proof of such God in Whose case '*pratyaksha pramana*' (i.e.) proof through direct perception could be provided, is not available. (Sāmkhya Darśana 1—92).

Because when there is no '*pratyaksha jnana*' available about God, then '*anumana*' and other proofs also cannot be possible. (5—10)

The translator has given a foot-note under these meanings wherein it is stated as below:—

اس جگہ سانکھیہ درشن میں ایشور کو 'باھیہ پرتیکش' یعنی بیرونی حواس سے ثابت نہیں مانا ہے - مگر اندرونی حس یعنی

من سے یوگیوں کو ایشور کا پرتیکش ہونا صاف الفاظ میں تسلیم
کیا ہے ۔ (سوتر ۹۰ - ۹۱ - ۹۵ - ۹۶)

"Is jagah Sāmkhya Darśana men Īśvara kō 'bāhya pratyaksha' yānī berūnī havās se sābit nahīn mānā hai, magar andrūnī his yānī man se yōgiyōn kō Īśvara kā pratyaksha honā sāf alfāz men taslīm kiyā hai." Sūtras 90, 91, 95, 96.

Translation —

At this place in the Sāmkhya Darśana, the establishment of God's existence on the basis of direct knowledge obtained through external senses has not been admitted, but it has been admitted in clear words that *Yogis* have direct knowledge of God through their internal sense, i.e. mind. . (Sūtras 90, 91, 95, 96).

On a perusal of this note, the last sentence of the foot-note referred to earlier becomes quite clear, because when this is read along with the Sūtras 1-92 and 5-10, it becomes quite clear that the author of the Sāmkhya Darśana admits that the existence of God cannot be established by means of external senses. And it also becomes quite clear that under these circumstances, the attempt of Swami Dayanand to venture to give '*pratyakṣha pramana*', for establishing the existence of God and the attempt of the translator, in the name of Sāmkhya Darśana, to include in Swami Dayanand's definition of '*pratyakṣha pramana*' such a statement (i.e. the knowledge obtained through internal senses) which Sāmkhya Darśana absolutely rejects is nothing short of ruining the teachings of the Sages of the past.

131. Question—Leave aside what has been written by the translator of the authorised Urdu Translation of Satyārtha Prakāśa. For this, the translator himself or at the most the Arya-Pratinidhi-Sabha which published the translation are responsible and not the Arya Samajist public generally. It is admitted that your objections establish

the fact that the first argument of Swami Dayanand, i.e. the acceptance of the knowledge of the skill and wisdom of God as '*pratyakṣha pramana*' in support of the existence of God and his third argument which accepts the experiences of *Yogis* during *Samadhi* as '*pratyakṣha pramana*' for ordinary people are both against the principles of logic. But if his first argument is accepted as '*anumana pramana*' (i.e. inference of the cause from the effect) and his third argument as '*śabda pramana*', there would be no harm. By doing so, at least the existence of God can be established.

Answer—There is no Satsangi who denies the existence of God. The Satsangi public does not ask for any proof and yet believes in the existence of God. But the subject matter for investigation here is the reasoning of Swami Dayanand and not belief or disbelief in the existence of God. It is, therefore, to be seen whether the arguments which have been advanced on his side are sufficiently strong and what kind of arguments are those. It has to be stated with great regret that his first argument cannot be included in the category of '*anumana pramana*' even and the third argument can be accepted as '*śabda pramana*' only for those who believe in the internal experiences of the *Yogis*.

132. Question—Well, why cannot the first argument be accepted as '*anumana pramana*' ?

Answer—Simply because it is opposed to the definition of '*anumana pramana*' given by Swami Dayanand himself. You may just refer to pages 62 and 63 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition. There it is stated on the authority of a Sūtra of Nyāya Darśana as below :—

جس سے پہلے پرتیکش کا وجود ہو یعنی جس پدارتھ کا جز
یا کل کسی وقت یا جگہ پرتیکش ہوا ہو اس کے ساتھ رہنے والے
جز کے دوسرے مشاہدہ ہونے کی صورت میں اس غائب از نظر کے
علم ہونے کو انومان کہتے ہیں -

"Jis se pahle pratyaksha kā vajūd hō, yānī jis padārth kā juzv yā kul kisī vaqt yā jagah pratyaksha huā hō, uske sāth rahne vāle juzv ke dūr se mushāhidā hōne kī sūrat men us gāyab az nazar ke 'ilm hōne kō 'anumāna' kahte hain".

Translation —

'*Anumana Pramana*' is that knowledge prior to which '*pratyaksha jnana*' must have existed. In other words, '*anumana*' is that knowledge of an invisible thing of which a part or the whole was perceived earlier at some time or at some place and a part of which used to be co-existent with that which was directly perceived.

After this, the author has described three categories of '*anumana pramana*'. First, in which effect is inferred from the cause, e.g. the idea of rain on seeing the clouds; second, inference regarding the cause from the effect, e.g. the idea of there being a father on seeing the son; and third, inference by analogy or similarity e.g. inference regarding some one reaching another person's house by walking from one's own experience of reaching somebody's house by walking. After describing these three kinds of '*anumana pramana*', the word '*anumana*' has been explained as below:—

انومان لفظ کے معنی یہ ھیں کہ جو پرتیکس کے بعد پیدا ھو
جیسے دھوئیں کے پرتیکش دیکھنے کے بغیر غائب از نظر آگ کا
علم کبھی نہیں ھو سکتا -

Anumānn lafz ke mānī yeh hain ki jō pratyaksha ke bād paidā hō, jaise dhuyen ke pratyaksha dekhne ke bagair gāyab-az-nazar āg kā 'ilm kabhī nahīn hō saktā."

Translation —

The word '*anumana*' means that which comes into being after '*pratyaksha*', e.g. knowledge or idea of fire which is not visible cannot be had without first having direct knowledge or '*pratyaksha jnana*' of smoke.

From this definition of the word '*anumana*' two things necessarily follow. First, that the whole or some part of a thing must have been directly percieved at some time or at some place ; secondly, that after this experience or direct perception, one may see some part which may always be co-existent with that. When these two conditions are fulfilled, conception of the remaining part of anything or the whole of it, which is not visible, on the basis of what has been perceived directly is known as '*anumana*'. Thus on this basis it has been said that as we have seen the fire and smoke together many times, our conception that there must be fire when we see smoke somewhere is knowledge derived from '*anumana*'. Similarly, it is '*anumana*' when we think of the son on seeing the father or think of the father on seeing the son, simply because we have seen them together many times. But according to this principle the '*anumana*' of the existence of God on observing His skill and wisdom in the creation is justifiable and proper for that individual only who might have many times observed God and His skill and wisdom associated together. And it would not only be unjustifiable but extremely improper if we compel others who have not seen God and His attributes together to form a conception about the existence of God on the basis of the observation of His skill and wisdom in the creation and if such people say in reply that it is not possible for them to have any '*anumana*' of God as they have never seen God and His skill together, they would be fully justified in saying so. Just imagine whether a villager would necessarily think of the machinery for the manufacture of paper or of the skilled workers of a paper mill merely on seeing a piece of paper.

133. Question—But those who are acquainted with the organization of factories or workshops and with arts and crafts and manufacturing processes can, on observing all the workmanship, wisdom and system visible in the creation, form an idea about the existence of God on the basis of

the argument that as there are persons who manufacture paper, pens, inkpot, bicycle, motor car, etc., there must be some Creator of this universe also.

Answer—But first of all, this is not an '*anumana*' of cause from effect and secondly, whosoever acts according to the principle of this analogy, will be entitled only to imagine that the creator of this universe is some very capable human being. This analogy will however enable him to imagine only the existence of a human artist and not of any formless God Who has neither eyes nor hands and feet and even then He sees the entire creation and is omnipresent. He will be quite justified in thinking also that just as there are different artists for making different kinds of things, similarly there may be different and separate artists responsible for creating different things in nature. For example, there may be a creator of the Sun and another of the Moon; there may be one creator of fire and another of water. There may be a creator who has created the lion and another, the cow and similarly a creator of the elephant and another, of the mosquito, etc. In short, it will not be necessary for him to believe in the existence of one God only. Moreover, he shall be fully justified if he says that the arguments advanced are very weak or are rather quite wrong for there is no doubt that there is always some maker or other of all things made by man but this would in no way prove that there must be some creator of those things also that have not been made by man. Obviously, the principle which has been arrived at from observation pertains only to the activities of man and does not pertain to things and matters beyond the capacity and sphere of man and therefore according to the principles of logic it would be quite improper to apply the principle pertaining to human activities to things which are beyond man's capacity and sphere. Moreover, such person shall also be entitled to enquire how it would be possible for the same God to make a meek animal like the cow and a ferocious beast like the

lion and to create a planet as luminous as the Sun and another planet as dark as the Moon. Obviously, from this difference in the characteristics of the things created, the only inference that can be drawn is that there are a number of makers who have different capabilities and different temperaments. Besides, as has already been stated, if the existence of God is established on noticing skill and wisdom in the creation, why have not the scientists and the philosophers of the world become believers in God? What has happened to their intelligence and power of observation? They do believe in there being a cause for all things in the creation and also in the universality of the laws of nature but also deny the existence of God altogether. They claim that all their problems are solved without having belief in God.

134, While describing how cause could be inferred from effect, Swami Dayanand has given a few examples on page 62 of the Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition. To one of those examples, we want to invite the particular attention of the readers. It is stated :—

جگت کو دیکھ کر قدیمی علت مادی اور فاعل حقیقی
خداوند تعالے کا ۔

"Jāgat kō dekh kar qadīmī, illat-i-māddī aur Fāile haqīqī Khudāvand ta'alā kā",

Translation —

'*Anumana*' or conception of the eternal and physical cause and the true creator i.e. God, on seeing the creation.

We are astonished to read this example and to find that Swami Dayanand on observing the effect i.e. the creation, obtains knowledge about the cause i.e. the Creator or God through '*anumana*', while on page 205 (Satyārtha Prakāsa, Urdu) he obtains the '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge of God, as a result of the same observation i.e.

on observing the creation. Just consider what else could the helpless Satsangi do than feel perplexed on reading such contradictory statements !

135. Is it permissible on the basis of all this investigation to conclude that Swami Dayanand, while defining the different *pramanas*, quotes references from the *Darśana Śastras* but when it comes to establishing his own claims, he does not care in the least for the principles laid own in those *Śastras.* The three *pramanas* (proofs) that he put forward to establish the existence of God are neither '*pratyaksha pramanas*' nor '*anumana pramanas*', nor has he, while presenting the arguments, made any distinction between the meanings of the words '*pramana*' and '*jnana*' nor between the authoritative definitions of the *Darśanas* and his own wrong and misguided interpretations. Surely, the world is justified in expecting from perfect *Yogis* and great scholars reasoning of a higher order than that presented by Swami Dayanand.

136. It is necessary to deal once again with the subject of '*pratyaksha pramana*', for Swami Dayanand, besides the '*pratyaksha pramana*' of the existence of God through observation of His skill and wisdom in the creation, has put forward a second '*pratyaksha pramana*' by referring to the condition of man's heart. But this also is as defective as the first one was. If this *pramana* is examined, it would appear that the basis for this *pramana* is the existence of those feelings of joy or shame which appear in a man's heart when he begins to perform some good or bad act and which, in common parlance, are spoken of collectively as the 'Voice of Conscience'. Swami Dayanand believes that these feelings come to man as inspiration from God. He says :—

جیو کی خواہش اور علم وغیرہ چونکہ اس وقت اسی خواہش
کی ہوئی چیز کی طرف جھک جاتے ہیں - اس لئے اس لمحہ میں جو
آتما کے اندر برے کام کے کرنے میں خوف تامل اور شرم اور اچھے
کاموں کے کرنے میں بے خوفی - عدم تامل خوشی اور حوصلہ پیدا

ھوتا ھے وہ جیوواتما کي طرف سے نھیں بلکه پرماتما کی طرف سے ھے۔

"Jīva kī khwāhish aur 'ilm vagairah chūnki us vaqt usī khwāhish kī huyee chīz kī taraf jhuk jāte hain, is liye us lamhā men jō ātmā ke andar bure kām ke karne men khauf, ta'ammul aur sharam aur achchhe kāmōn ke karne men bekhaufi, adam ta'ammul, khushī aur hauslā paidā hōtā hai voh jīvātmā kī taraf se nahīn balke Paramātmā kī taraf se hai."

Translation —

As man's desire and knowledge etc. lean towards the desired object, therefore fear, delay and shame which one faces at the time of doing bad acts or fearlessness, lack of hesitation, happiness and courage which one feels in doing good acts come from God and not from the spirit.

But those who know even the A B C of modern philosophy know very well that the source of the 'Voice of Conscience' is man's sub-conscious mind and not God.

Suppose there is a Mohammedan and his conscience prods him on to make a sacrifice like a devoted Musalman on the occasion of 'Id. After two years the individual becomes a member of the Arya Samaj and establishes his connection with that Branch of Arya Samaj which is opposed to meat-eating. The result is that his conscience now opposes meat-eating and preaches non-violence to him. Has some other God now come to stay within him, or have the ideas of the same ancient God now changed ?

137. Besides, thousands of people know from their own experience that since childhood their conscience has changed its position again and again in respect of certain things. Will it be necessary then to acknowledge that with the change in our ideas on account of our new experiences, a change also takes place in the knowledge of God and His teachings ?

138. The third *pramana* given by Swami Dayanand pertains to the state of *Samadhi*, but is there any connection between the '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge described in the *Sutras* of Sage Gautam and the '*jnana*' or knowledge pertaining to the state of *Samadhi*? The state of *Samadhi* comes into existence only when all the *chittavrittis* are completely restrained. Would any individual who believes in the definition of '*pratyaksha jnana*' given by Sage Gautam dare to call the knowledge, which is attained on *chittavrittis* being thoroughly restrained, as '*Pratyaksha jnana*'? This '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge of the *Yogis* is beyond the reach and understanding of ordinary men and for them it is only a *śabda-pramana*. It is stated on page 63 of the 4th Urdu Edition of the Satyārtha Prakāśa itself as below :—

'आप्त का उपदेश शब्द प्रमाण है'

"Āpta kā updeśa śabda.pramāṇa hai."

Translation—

The teachings of an *Apta Purusha* are *Śabda-pramana*.

The meaning of the word '*Apta*' has been described in detail in para 75 of Part II of Yathārtha Prakāśa[1]. Those who have obtained the Vision of God by performing Yoga practices are true *Apta Purushas*. There is no mention at all in the Biography of Swami Dayanand that he ever had the Vision of God in his life-time. The only thing written there is that he wandered in search of Perfect *Yogis* for a long time and as he could not contact any perfect *Yogi*, he was obliged to apply himself to the study of grammar and to the service of his countrymen till the last days of his life. Evidently, Swami Dayanand's belief in the existence of God was based on '*anumana pramana*'. His attempt to give '*pratyaksha pramana*' regarding the existence of God is therefore really a matter which is most astonishing.

---

1. Page 78 of the English translation published by the Radhasoami Satsang Sabha in 1957. Also Note 2 on page 64 of this book.

XVIII

MERCY AND JUSTICE

139. A little further on in the same *Samullas*, Page 220, there is some discussion regarding mercy and justice, and it is very interesting. It is written there :—

سوال—ایشور اپنے بھگتوں کے پاپ معاف کرتا ھے یا نہیں ؟
جواب—نہیں ۔ کیونکہ اگر وہ پاپ معاف کرے تو اس کا
انصاف جاتا رھے اور تمام انسان سخت پاپی ھو جاویں کیونکہ
درگذر کے سنتے ھی ان کو پاپ کرنے میں بےخوفی اور حوصلہ
پیدا ھو جاوے ۔ مثلاً اگر راجہ گناہ معاف کردیا کرے تو لوگ
حوصلہ پاکر اور بھی بڑے بڑے پاپ کریں ۔ کیونکہ راجہ گناہ
بخش دیا کریگا اور ان کو بھی بھروسہ ھو جاویگا کہ ھم راجہ سے
بذریعہ حرکات ھاتھ جوڑنے وغیرہ کے اپنے قصور معاف کرا لیوینگے۔
جو لوگ قصور نہیں کرتے وہ تقصیروں سے نہ ڈر کر پاپ کرنے
میں راغب ھو جاوینگے اسلئے تمام اعمال کا مناسب نتیجہ دینا
ایشور کا کام ھے نہ کہ معاف کرنا ۔

Savāl—Īśvar apane bhagtōn ke pāp muāf kartā hai, yā nahīn ?

Javāb—Nahīn. Kyōnki agar voh pāp muāf kare, tō uskā insāf jātā rahe, aur tamām insān sakht pāpī hō jāven, kyōnki darguzar ke sunte hī unkō pāp karne men bekhaufi aur hausalā paidā hō jāve. Maslan agar Rājā gunāh muāf kar diyā kare, tō lōg hausalā pā kar aur bhī baṛe baṛe pāp karen, kyōnki Rājā gunāh bakhsh diyā karegā, aur unkō bhī bharōsā hō jāvegā ke ham Rājā se bazarīye harkāt hāth jōṛane vagairah ke apne qasūr muāf karā levenge. Jō lōg qasūr nahīn karte voh bhī taqsīrōn se na ḍar kar pāp karne men rāghib hō jāvenge. Is liye tamām aimāl kā munāsib natījā denā Īśvara kā kām hai, na ki muāf karnā.

Translation—

Question—Does God pardon the sins of His devotees or not ?

Answer—No. He does not, for if He pardons sins, He would not remain just and all men will become great sinners because as soon as they hear that the sins can be pardoned, they would become fearless and bold in committing sins. For example, if the King begins to pardon crimes, people would become bold and would commit still greater crimes simply because the King would pardon their crimes and they would be confident also that they would have their crimes pardoned by the King by folding their hands before him, etc. Those who do not commit sins would also not be afraid of sins and would become inclined to sin. It is therefore the function of God to give suitable punishment in respect of all actions and not to pardon sins."[1]

---

1. Swami Dayanand while describing the idea of justice of God writes on page 284 of the 4th Urdu Edition of Satyārtha Prakāśa as follows :—

کیا اس دنیا میں لیاقت کی عمدہ کارگذاریوں کے بغیر عزت
دینے والا اور بدعملی کے بغیر سزا دینے والا قابل مذمت اور
بے وقعت نہیں ہوتا ؟ پس ایشور بےانصافی نہیں کرتا اور اس لئے
وہ کسی سے نہیں ڈرتا ۔

"Kyā is duniyā men liyāqat kī umdā kārguzāriyōn ke bagair izzat dene vālā aur bad'amalī ke bagair sazā dene vālā qābil mazammat aur bevaqa'at nahīn hōtā ? Pas Īśvara beinsāfi nahīn kartā aur is liye voh kisī se nahīn ḍartā."

Translation—

Is it not the case that in this world the person who honours another without the latter performing any good action or who punishes the latter without his performing any bad action, is considered fit for being condemned as a man of no substance ? God therefore does not do injustice and therefore He is not afraid of anybody.

But are the Viceroy and the King Emperor, who exercise their special privilege and mercifully pardon criminals, really afraid of everyone ?

Every sensible person admits that the object of punishment should be to reform the criminal and not to take revenge. It however appears from the principle enunciated by Swami Dayanand that God follows the rule of 'taking tooth for tooth and eye for eye' and that this is His sense of justice and mercy. Besides, is it really the case that forgiveness of offences and sins invariably leads to increase in their number? Had you no occasion to forgive the fault of some servant, subordinate or some relation or to have your own fault condoned by your elders, or your superior or officer? It has to be stated with regret that ordinary experience shows that if faults of sensible persons are forgiven, desirable reform in their character takes place in most cases and if inexperienced youngmen are sent to prison as a punishment for some fault, their condition worsens. Further, millions of Hindus, Mohammedans and Christians who entertain the hope of being forgiven their faults by God are behaving decently and leading their lives in peace and happiness, while thousands of wicked people who do not even believe in the existence of God indulge in committing crimes again and again.

140. Besides, it also needs enquiring how the idea that God forgives man merely on his begging for forgiveness arose in the mind of Swami Dayanand. The whole world knows that a wise man pardons the fault of any person only when the offender expresses his regret again and again and feels ashamed and penitent and repents sincerely and promises to behave better in future. It is also admitted on all hands that man can hope of his faults being forgiven only when, after repenting again and again and feeling ashamed of his conduct, he has a feeling of some relief in his heart.

141. The subject of mercy and justice has been discussed at another place also by Swami Dayanand[1].

1. Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition, Page 206.

Swami Dayanand writes there :—

انصاف اور رحم میں محض براے نام فرق ھے - کیونکہ جو
مطلب انصاف سے پورا ھوتا ھے وھی رحم سے - سزا دینے کا مدعا
یہ ھے کہ لوگ خطا سے باز آکر دکھ نہ پاویں - وھی مطلب رحم کا ھے-

"Insāf aur raham men mahaz barāye nām farq hai, kyōnke jō matlab insāf se pūrā hōtā hai vohī raham se. Sazā dene kā mudda'ā yeh hai ke lōg khatā se bāz ākar dukh na pāven. Vohī matlab raham kā hai."

Translation—

There is only a nominal difference between justice and mercy, for the object that is gained by justice is also gained by mercy. The object in inflicting punishment is that people may give up committing offences and thus may not have to suffer troubles. The same is the object of mercy."

But in this manner there is only a nominal difference in taking food and starving or travelling on horse-back and on foot, for both the former activities referred to above are for the object of maintaining physical health and the latter, for covering distance. And there is still another question, viz, 'What need is there for punishment if by forgiving the offence of a person, the object is achieved and the person concerned, on being forgiven, promises to give up committing faults in future ? Swami Dayanand in reply to this question writes :—

جس نے جیسا اور جتنا برا کام کیا ھو اس کو ویسی اور اتنی
ھی سزا دینی چاھئے - اسی کا نام انصاف ھے - اور اگر قصوروار کو
سزا نہ دی جاوے تو رحم صفحہ ھستی سے مٹ جاویگا -

"Jisne jaisā aur jitnā burā kām kiyā hō uskō vaisī aur utnī hī sazā deni chāhiye. Isī kā nām insāf hai. Aur agar qasūrwār kō sazā na dī jāve tō raham safahe hastī se miṭ jāvegā."

Translation —

Punishment should be of such a kind and of such severity as may be in consonance with the nature of the offence. This would be called justice. And if the offender is not punished, the quality of mercy would no more exist in the world.

In other words, Swami Dayanand believes that the only method available to man and God for bringing the offender on to the right path is that he should be suitably punished but the matter does not end here. Just refer to Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, Pages 189 and 199.

142. In these pages Swami Dayanand has prescribed, on the authority of Manusmṛiti, severe punishments for adultery and other heinous crimes. For example, it is stated that an adulteress should be torn to death by dogs in the presence of a large number of people and an adulterer should be burnt to death in the presence of a large number of people on an iron bedstead made red-hot in fire and the strange part of the thing is that these punishments are prescribed for ordinary persons who commit the crime once in a way and not specially for habitual offenders.

143. A little further on, another point has been raised in this connection that man has no right to punish any individual in this manner since he cannot create a part of any one's body nor can he give life to anyone and therefore such punishment is extremely harsh. The reply given by Swami Dayanand which is given below may now be perused:-

جو اسکو سخت سزا جانتے ہیں وہ انتظام ملکی کو نہیں سمجھتے کیونکہ ایک آدمی کو اس قسم کی سزا دینے سے تمام لوگ برے کاموں سے باز رہینگے اور افعال بد کو چھوڑ کر دھرم کے راستہ پر قائم ہونگے -

سچ پوچھئے تو یہ ہے کہ سزا کسی کے حصہ میں ایک رائی کے

دانہ جتنی بھی نہیں آویگی اور اگر نرم سزا دی جاوے تو برے
کام بہت بڑھ کر ہونے لگینگے - پس جس کو تم نرم سزا کہتے ہو
وہ کروڑوں گنا زیادہ ہونے کی وجہ سے کروڑوں گنا سخت ہوتی
ہے کیونکہ جب بہت سے آدمی برے کاموں کے مرتکب ہونگے تو
تھوڑی سزا ضرور دینی پڑیگی - اگر فرض کر لیا جاوے کہ ایک کو
سخت سزا کی حالت میں من بھر سزا ہوئی اور دوسرے کو نرم
سزا کی حالت میں پاؤ بھر - تو دو کو پاو اوپر ایک من سزا ہوتی
ہے اور وہ ہر حصہ میں فی کس آدھ پاؤ اور بیس سیر سزا آئی
تو ایسی نرم سزا کو شریر لوگ کیا سمجھتے ہیں - جو کہ ایک کو
من بھر کے بالمقابل ہزار آدمیوں کو ایک ایک پاؤ سزا ہووے
(تو شک نہیں کہ بجائے ایک کی سزا یابی کے ہزار آدمیوں کی
سزا یابی) نوع انسان پر سوا چھ من سزا ہونے کے باعث زیادہ
ہے اور یہی سخت ٹھہری اور وہ ایک من سزا کم اور نرم ہوئی -

"Javāb—Jō iskō sakht sazā jāñte hain voh intizām mulkī ke asūl kō nahīn samajhte, kyōnke ek ādmī kō is qism kī sazā dene se tamām lōg bure kāmōn se bāz rahenge aur af'āl bad kō chhōṛ kar dharm ke rāste par qāyam hōnge.

Sach pūchhiye tō yeh hai ki sazā kisī ke hisse men ek rāyee ke dāne jitnī bhī nahīn āvegī aur agar naram sazā dī jāve tō bure kām bahut baṛh kar hōne lagenge. Pas jiskō tum naram sazā kahte hō voh karōṛōn gunā ziādā hōne kī vajah se karōṛōn gunā sakht hōtī hai, kyōnke jab bahut se ādmī bure kāmōn ke murtkib hōnge tō thōṛī thōṛī sazā zarūr denī paṛegī. Agar farz kar liyā jāye ke ek kō sakht sazā kī hālat men man bhar sazā huyee aur dūsre kō naram sazā kī hālat men pāv bhar, tō dō kō pāv ūpar ek man sazā hōtī hai, aur voh har hisse men phī kas ādh pāv aur bīs ser sazā āyee, tō aisī naram sazā kō sharīr lōg kyā samajhte hain ? Jōke ek kō man bhar ke bilmuqābil hazār ādmiyōn kō ek pāv sazā hōve (tō shak nahīn ke bajāye ek kī sazāyābī ke hazār ādmiyōn kī sazāyābī) nūe insān par savā chheh man sazā hōne ke bāyas ziādā hai aur yehī sakht thehrī aur voh ek man sazā kam aur naram huyee."

Translation—

Answer—Those who consider this punishment as severe do not understand political and

administrative matters because by giving such severe punishment to a man all other persons would refrain from bad actions and would give up undesirable activities and remain steadfast on the righteous path. The truth is that in this way punishment would be infinitesimally small. And if punishment is not severe, undesirable activities would increase greatly. Thus what you call lenient punishment would be a million times more severe because it would lead to more crimes and thereby to more punishment for when there is a large number of people committing crimes, some punishment or other will have to be given to all of them. Suppose severe punishment amounts to one maund of punishment and lenient punishment amounts to a quarter seer, then the punishment to two persons would amount to 20 seers and 2 chhatak each. Now those who are wicked will not mind this punishment. If instead of one maund one thousand people are given a quarter seer of punishment each, then, in that case, total punishment would amount to six and a quarter maunds and therefore it would be severer and thus one maund of punishment would be less and lenient.

144. It would be good if this method of awarding punishment for offences is understood by the people of America for it appears from a perusal of the newspapers of that country that those who know the principles of criminal psychology, emphatically assert that treating the criminal leniently and teaching him to lead the life of a peaceful citizen is beneficial both to the criminal as well as to the country. Is it necessary to explain that with the exception of half-civilized races, nobody else would believe in the principles of justice and mercy laid down by Swami Dayanand or his method of preventing crime? The translator of the Satyārtha Prakāsa (Urdu Edition) has, by adding his own foot-note in support of the opinions of Swami Dayanand,

attempted to establish the correctness of those opinions, but such efforts are meaningless when Swami Dayanand himself has recorded his own position in clear words.

145. The words of Swami Dayanand that "there is only a nominal difference between justice and mercy" show that he did not very much differentiate between justice and mercy. He has taken great pains in the Ṣatyārtha Prakāśa to make this opinion of his, strong and free from doubts. Accordingly on page 206, after explaining the above two words, he says that if Mercy and Justice are taken to be synonymous terms, the following question arises:—

سوال—پھر رحم اور انصاف دو لفظ کیوں ھیں - کیونکہ اگر
ان دونوں کا ایک ھی مدعا ھے تو دو لفظوں کا ھونا فضول ھے -
اس سے تو ایک لفظ کا رھنا اچھا تھا - پس ثابت ھوا کہ رحم اور
انصاف کا مقصد ایک نہیں -"

Savāl—"Phir raham aur insāf dō lafz kyōn hain, kyōnke agar in dōnōn kā ek hī mudd'ā hai tō dō lafzōn kā hōnā fazūl hai. Is se tō ek lafz kā rahnā achchhā thā. Pas sābit huā ke raham aur insāf kā maqsad ek nahīn."

Translation —

Question—"Why should there be two words at all, viz. 'mercy and justice', for if both the words refer to the same thing, it is meaningless to have two separate words ? It would have been better if there had been one word only. Thus it is established that the meaning of the two words 'mercy and justice' is not one and the same.

Then subsequently while giving his answer to this question, he has given arguments which are so clear that after reading them, the position of Swami Dayanand becomes free from doubts for all time. That answer and the arguments are given below :—

جواب — کیا ایک معني کے بہت سے لفظ اور ایک لفظ کے
بہت سے معنی نہیں ھوتے ؟

سوال—ہوتے ہیں -

جواب—تو پھر تم کو شک کیوں ہوا ؟

سوال—اسلئے کہ دنیا میں ایسا سنا جاتا ہے -

جواب—دنیا میں تو سچی اور جھوٹی دونوں باتیں سننے میں آتی ہیں - الا ہمارا کام اُن کو غور سے تحقیق کرنا ہے - دیکھو ایشور کی رحمت کاملہ تو یہ ہے کہ اس نے تمام جیووں کی حاجت براري کے لئے دنیا میں سب چیزیں پیدا کرکے عطا کر رکھي ہیں - پس اس سے بڑھ کر رحم اسکے ما سواء اور کونسا ہے - باقی رہا انصاف - اُس کا نتیجہ صریح دکھلائی دیتا ہے کیونکہ سکھ دکھ کے کم و بیش ہونے کی حالت اُس نتیجہ کو آشکارا کر رہي ہے - ان دونوں میں فرق اتنا ہي ہے کہ من میں سب کو سکھ ہونے اور دکھ رفع ہونے کی خواہش و تدبیر رحم ہے ارر بیرونی حرکات یعنی قید و قطع عضو (بدن کے کسي حصہ کو کات دینا) وغیرہ سے ٹھیک ٹھیک سزا دینا انصاف کہلاتا ہے - دونوں کا مقصد ایک ہی ہے یعني سب کو پاپ اور دکھوں سے چھڑا دینا -"

"Javāb—Kyā ek mānī ke bahut se lafz aur ek lafz ke bahut se mānī nahīn hōte ?

Savāl—Hōte hain.

Javāb—Tō phir tumkō shak kyōn huā ?

Savāl—Is liye ke duniyā men aisā sunā jātā hai.

Javāb—Duniyā men tō sachchī aur jhūṭhī dōnōn bāten sunane men ātī hain. Illā hamārā kām unkō gaur se tahqīq karnā hai. Dekhō Īśvara kī rahmat kāmilah tō yeh hai ke usne tamām jīvōn ki hājatbarārī ke liye duniyā men sab chīzen paidā karke atā kar rakkhī hain. Pas is se baṛh kar raham iske māsivāye aur kaunsā hai. Bāqī rahā insāf, uskā natījā sarīh dikhlāyee detā hai. Kyōnke sukh dukh ke kam vā besh hōne kī hālat us natīje kō āshikārā kar rahī hai. In dōnōn men farq itnā hī hai ki man men sabkō sukh hōne aur dukh rafā hōne kī khwāhish va tadbīr raham hai. Aur berūnī harkāt yānī qaid va qatā uzav (badan ke kisī hisse kō kāṭ denā) vagairah se ṭhīk ṭhīk sazā denā insāf kehlātā hai. Dōnōn kā maqsad ek hī hai yānī sabkō pāp aur dukhōn se chhuṛā denā".

Translation—

Answer—Are there not many words which have one and the same meaning and many meanings to one word ?

Question—There are.

Answer—Why did you then entertain any doubts ?

Question—Because it is so heard in the world.

Answer—We come across both true and false things in the world, but it is our business to make investigations about them carefully. The greatest mercy of God is that He created all kinds of things and gave them to man for the satisfaction of all his needs. Thus there could be nothing more merciful then this. As regards justice, its result is clearly visible, i.e. the fact that happiness and unhappiness increase and decrease itself indicates that there is justice. The only difference between these two (i.e. mercy and justice) is that the presence, in the mind, of the idea of giving happiness to all and removing the troubles and unhappiness of all and making efforts therefor is called mercy, while outward things, viz, 'imprisonment' or 'cutting away any part of the body' etc. and thus giving correct punishment is known as justice. The object of both these is the same, i.e. to liberate all persons from sins and from troubles."

146. Is the opinion of Swami Dayanand regarding 'mercy' and 'justice' satisfactory ? Obviously, he does not distinguish between the standards of man and God regarding justice nor does he care to remember that the opportunity of doing justice is available only to a King, officers or elected individuals, while every individual has always the opportunity of showing mercy. Justice is based on the desire to give every one his deserts while mercy is based on the element of sympathy. And further that

the mercy of God should not be limited to the production of things in the world and their availability to man for the satisfaction of his needs, for when that Omniscient God knows that *Jivas* are weak and that on account of their weaknesses, they would most certainly commit sins and will thereby become unhappy and worried, His mercy should also be anxiously directed to relieve man from miseries and troubles and to enable him to make spiritual progress. His mercy should be such as may know no rest till *Jivas* are freed from troubles and miseries of all kinds and are granted the highest possible spiritual status.

147. Everyone knows that there is a great difference between the relative position of the subject and the king and the relative position of man and God. Whosoever is appointed from amongst men to do justice, mostly concerns himself with granting relief to the plaintiff and if the accused or the defendant is able to arrive at a settlement with the plaintiff, the judge does not need to deliver judgement based on his own opinion. The position of the king is quite different. His duty is not merely to give relief to the plaintiff but also to prevent the accused from committing crimes in future and to pass orders keeping in mind the good of the plaintiff, the accused and the entire community over which the king rules. And as according to the constitution and laws of the country the king wields the authority to reward and punish, it becomes necessary for him, while doing justice, to follow the laws of the country. This is the reason why hundreds of criminals, in the absence of sufficient proof required in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Penal Code to establish their crime, are set at liberty by the courts. But as God is omniscient and is free from and above the mistakes and defects of the laws of man and as He has a thousand times greater anxiety than the king for the good of both the plaintiff and the accused, the standard of justice of God should be different and far nobler than the standard which a king or the people can have. It is admitted on all

hands that it is not the function of God to settle the quarrels of the people just as Government officials have to do in the world. His is the responsibility to arrange for the reward and punishment of every man according to his good and bad deeds in such a way that mankind may go on advancing further and further towards ultimate good. It is therefore not necessary for God to conform His principles of justice to the standards of man's justice. For example, according to the system of human justice, punishment for every case of murder is execution of the murderer, but if any individual commits this crime and God knows, Omniscient as He is, that the said individual had in his previous life been killed at the hands of the person now murdered and that the present crime was committed by way of revenge for the crime committed against him, this man according to the system of justice of God would not be considered a criminal deserving of severe punishment. In short, though justice and mercy are both intended for the good of man, but there is a clear difference between the two, and God's justice cannot be expected to follow the standards of human justice.

148. Here, it is necessary to add also that though there is obvious difference between mercy and justice, there is still occasion for man to temper his justice by mercy. For example, if any individual by mistake commits a crime for which he deserves punishment of fine and if the officer believes that the criminal is poor and that he committed the crime merely because he is ignorant, he has the authority to punish the criminal according to the laws in force and fine him, but in order to show mercy to him, he may deposit the amount of fine from his own pocket. Similarly, man can also do justice while showing mercy. For example, flood inundates some village and crops of all the inhabitants of the village are destroyed. You are moved by feelings of mercy and you get ready to help those people and instead of distributing money equally to all persons by way of help, you arrange that every individual should get financial aid

according to his needs. Then in these circumstances, you act with mercy as well as justice. But from the above two examples, it is further established that mercy and justice are not synonymous.

149. And if any Arya Samajist brother obstinately holds that these words are synonymous, he may be asked to say whether the action of Swami Dayanand in having the person who poisoned him sent away to Nepal with money given by himself so that he could escape the clutches of law, was based on mercy or on justice? And did this action of his lead to increase in justice and peace of the world or did it encourage criminals to poison *Mahatmas* fearlessly and also get money from them? 'Fearlessly', because *Mahatmas* would pay money from their own pockets and would try to protect the criminals from punishment. It would not be improper to say that Swami Dayanand wrote whatever came to his mind at that time, but his own heart was more inclined towards mercy than towards justice. As regards severe punishment, the only thing that now needs to be added is that it succeeds in its object only when it is rarely given. If it is given every day and particularly when according to the advice of Swami Dayanand such punishments are given in the presence of the public, not only do they not produce any effect, but they also make the people in general cruel and merciless. For those men and women who witness living persons like themselves every second or third day being burnt on the red hot iron bedstead or being bitten to pieces by dogs, it would become an ordinary experience to have anybody put to death or eaten by dogs. We need not go so far. The children of those families in which animals and birds are killed, cruelly kill innocent creatures and birds, in mere fun etc. And cruelty of the people of Afghanistan and Africa is so well-known to the people at large that it is not necessary to record it here. Thus severe punishment should be given only rarely and in exceptional cases and these punishments

should be awarded only to habitual criminals and habitual criminals can be found in any country only when ordinary criminals are let off with light punishment or after warning when they have commited crime once or more than once. Thus if man finds himself profitting from lenient treatment, greater leniency and greater wisdom can be expected from God who is the fountain-head of mercy and most merciful. The principle, viz, 'tooth for tooth and eye for eye', is the principle of revenge. It pleases neither any sensible person nor Omniscient God.

XIX

PRAYERS TO AND PRAISE AND WORSHIP OF GOD—DISCUSSED

150. The difference between mercy and justice has been dealt with in more than necessary detail. It is now time that we take up the important subject for throwing light on which all this ground has been prepared. The question is whether God listens to the prayers of human beings and grants them. Almost all those people of the world who believe in the existence of God pray to God at least once or twice everyday and believe that prayers offered sincerely, if they are not injurious or harmful to others, are generally granted, and in response to these prayers help becomes available from some unknown source and difficult situations take a favourable turn. However, as Swami Dayanand believes that God likes justice only and according to him 'justice' means giving proper and adequate punishment for every fault and not forgiving any person, it becomes meaningless for a man to praise God and to offer prayers. Thus it is stated in *Samullas* 7 of the Satyārtha Prakāsa that man should no doubt praise God, offer prayers to Him and also worship Him but not in the hope that as a result

of his praising God and offering prayers to Him, God would act against His Own laws and wash away the sin of the person who offers prayers[1]. On this, one would naturally ask what advantage will be gained by offering prayer. Swami Dayanand has answered this question in detail so that there may be no ambiguity about the matter. The substance of his answer is given below :—

ستتي کرنے سے ایشور میں محبت - اسکے صفات و فعل و
عادات ذهن نشین هو جانے سے اپنی صفات و اعمال و عادات کا
سدهار هوتا هے - پرارتهنا کرنے سے غیر متکبری - حوصله و حمایت
حاصل هوتی هے -

"Stuti karne se Īśvara men mōhabbat, uske sifāt va f'el vā ādāt zehan nashīn hō jāne se apnī sifāt vā a'imāl vā ādāt kā sudhār hōtā hai. Prārthanā karne se ghair mutkabbarī, hauslā va himāyat hāsil hōtī hai"

Translation —

When one praises God, one develops love for Him and as His qualities, activities and ways are deeply impressed on man's mind, his own qualities, actions and nature improve and non-egotism, courage and a feeling of being protected grows.

But as has already been shown in the preceding pages, Swami Dayanand does not stick to this opinion also. He writes further on :—

جو شخص بهانڈ کی مانند پرمیشور کے اوصاف گاتا جاتا هے
اور اپنے چال چلن کو نهیں سدهارتا اسکا ستتی کرنا بے فایده هے -

"Jō shakhs mehaz bhāṇḍ kī mānind Parmeśvara ke ausāf gātā jātā hai aur apne chāl chalan kō nahīn sudhārtā, uskā stuti karnā befāidā hai."

---

1. Vide Page 208 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdu Edition.

Translation —

If a person simply goes on praising the qualities of God like a ministrel and does not reform his character, his praises of God would do no good to him.

(Satyārtha Prakāsa Page 209).

If by praising God, His qualities get deeply impressed on a man's mind and if on the divine qualities getting deeply impressed on the mind, the actions and nature of a person who praises God are reformed, how could the act of praising God be said to be useless ? If merely praising God is useless for a man, why is it written on page 215 as follows :—

پرمیشور کی ستتی - پرارتھنا اور اپاسنا ضرور کرنی چاھئے -
اس کا نتیجہ تو علیحدہ ھوگا لیکن آتما کی طاقت اس قدر بڑھیگی
کہ پہاڑ جیسے دکھ کے ھونے پر بھی نہ گھبڑایگا بلکہ سب کو
برداشت کر سکیگا - کیا یہ چھوٹی بات ھے ؟ اور جو شخص
پرمیشور کی ستتی - پرارتھنا و اپاسنا نہیں کرتا وہ احسان فراموش
اور سخت جاھل بھی ھوتا ھے -

"Parmeśvara kī stuti, prārthanā aur upāsnā zarūr karnī chāhiye. Iskā natījā tō alehdā hōgā, magar Ātmā kī tāqat is qadar baṛhegī ke pahāṛ jaise dukh ke hōne par bhī na ghabṛāegā balke sab kō bardāsht kar sakegā. Kyā yeh chhōṭī bāt hāi ? Aur jō shakhs Parmeśvara kī stuti, prārthanā va upāsnā nahīn kartā voh ahsān-farāmōsh aur sakht jāhil bhī hōtā hai."

Translation —

One must praise God and offer prayers to Him and worship Him. This would automatically bring its own result and in addition the spiritual power of the man would develop to such an extent that such a man would not only not get perplexed even if he is confronted with the greatest trouble, but he would patiently put up with everything. Is this a small gain ? The person who does not praise God or offer prayers to Him nor worships Him is ungrateful and a great fool.

Clearly this is a strange philosophy. On the one hand, it is emphasized that man must praise God, otherwise he would be ungrateful and a great fool and it is suggested that by praising God, the qualities, actions and habits of man improve, while on the other hand, it is said that if man will not make an effort to improve his character, his praises of God would be useless. If really, praise of God results in improvement of character only and if you insist that every individual should first improve his character and then only praise God, what advantage can a man then expect by praising God ?

151. On page 698 of the 'Complete Biography of Swami Dayanand' by Mahāśaya Lakshamaṇa, the written discussion which took place at Bareilly on 27th August 1879 between Swami Dayanand and Rev. Scott is recorded. The Christian Priest claimed that God punishes sins as well as pardons them. Swami Dayanand criticized this and said :—

یہ بات پرسپر ورِدھ ہے۔ کیا آدھا دنڈ دیتا ہے اور آدھا معاف
کرتا ہے یا کچھ کم زیادہ - جیسے ایشور سب باتیں جانتا ہے ویسے
ہی جیو لوگ جانتے ہیں یا کم زیادہ ؟ جیسے ہمارے بیچ میں
نیاء دھیش نیایکاری اور انیایکاری ہوتا ہے ویسا ہی ایشور ہے یا
فقط نیایکاري ؟ جو نیایکاری ہے تو معاف کرنا کہاں ؟ کیونکہ نیائے
اس کا نام ہے کہ جس نے جتنا جیسا کام کیا اس کو اتنا ویسا پھل
دے دیا - جو کسي قدر ایشور کو جانتے ہیں - تو میں پوچھتا
ہوں کہ ایشور کی سب باتوں میں ایسي ہي ریت ہے یا کچھ کم
زیادہ - میں بھی مانتا ہوں کہ ایشور کے ساتھ ہمارا راجہ پتا کا
سمبندھ ہے لیکن کیا انیائے کرنے کے لئے ہے ؟ کبھی نہیں - ویدادی
پستکوں میں معاف کرنا نہیں لکھا ہے.........جب معاف کرتا ہے
تو ایشور پاپ کا بڑھانے والا ہوتا ہے کیونکہ جیوں کو پاپ کرنے
میں حوصلہ بڑھتا ہے - اتیادی

'Yeh bāt paraspar viruddh hai. Kyā ādhā daṇḍ detā hai aur ādhā muāf kartā hai yā kuchh kam zyādā? Jaise Īśvar

sab bāten jāntā hai vaise hī jīv lōg jānate hain yā kam zyādā? Jaise hamāre bīch men nyāyādhīsh nyāyakārī anyāyakārī hōtā hai vaisā hī Īśvar hai yā faqat nyāyakārī hai, tō muāf karnā kahān? Kyōnke nyāya iskā nām hai ke jisne jitnā jaisā kām kiyā, uskō utanā vaisā phal de diyā. Jō kisī qadar Īśvar kō jānate hain tō main pūchhtā hūn ke Īśvar kī sab bātōn men aisī hī rītī hai yā kuchh kam zyādā? Main bhī mānatā hūn ke Īśvar ke sāth hamārā rājā pitā kā sambandh hai lekin kyā anyāya karne ke liye hai? Kabhī nahīn. Vedādi pustakōn men muāf karnā nahīn likhā hai.........jab muāf kartā hai tō Īśvar pāp kā baṛhāne vālā hōtā hai kyōnke jīvōn kō pāp karne men hausalā baṛhatā hai,' Ityādi.

Translation —

These two things are contradictory to each other. Does God punish a person for one half of his offence and pardon the other half or in greater and lesser proportions? Do the *Jivas* know everything like God knows or know more or less? Just as among men, a judge may be just or may be unjust, is God also like this or is He only just? If He is only just, no question of any pardon by Him arises for justice means that the person responsible for a certain action should get the fruit of that action in the manner and to the extent of that action. If they know God to some extent, I would enquire if this is the method followed by God in every matter or slightly more or less. I admit that we have our relationship with God as if He were our father or king, but is it only for doing injustice? No, never. Pardon by God is not mentioned in the *Vedas* and other similar books. If God pardons, He would encourage sins because *Jivas* would then feel encouraged to commit sins, etc.

The Christian priest in his reply, said, "Just as pain is removed on taking medicine even though one does not know anything about the medicine, similarly man's sins can be

pardoned even though man does not know how God actually grants pardon.

In reply to this Swami Dayanand posed the following question :—

کیا دوا کا نیم سے سیون کرنا - پرھیز کرنا - ویدیہ کے کہنے
میں چلنا - اپنی مرضی سے نہ چلنا ڈنڈ نہیں ھے ؟

"Kyā davā kā niyam se sevan karnā, parhez karnā, vaidya ke kahne men chalnā, apnī marzī se na chalnā, daṇḍ nahīn hai ?"

Translation—

Is it not sufficient punishment for a man to have to use medicines regularly, to follow a prescribed regimen, to live according to the instructions of the physician and not according to one's own free will ?

Now if regular use of medicines, obedience to instructions of the physician, avoidance of diet consisting of unsuitable articles are considered sufficient punishment for physical ailments and this punishment results in deliverance of man from the sin related to that physical ailment, would not then true repentance, weeping through shame and promise to lead life with care and to follow instructions of Great Personalities in future lead to his deliverance and pardon from other sins ?

152. And if there is no mention of pardon by God in the *Vedas* and other holy books why have the following *mantras* been given there ?

अथर्ववेद काण्ड ४ सूक्त ३३

पाप से छूटने के लिए।

हमारे पाप को जला डाल, हे अग्नि, हमारे ऐश्वर्य को चमका, हमारे पाप को जला डाल। (मंत्र १)

(1) Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 4, Sūkta 33

Pāp se chhūṭne ke liye

Hamāre pāp kō jalā ḍāl, he Agne ! hamāre aiśvarya kō chamkā, hamāre pāp kō jalā ḍāl. (Mantra 1)

Translation—

Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 4, Sūkta 33

Prayer for being freed from Sin

Burn all my sins O Agni ! Enhance our glory and add to our prosperity; burn all our sins.[1]

अथर्ववेद काण्ड ७ सूक्त ४३

पाप और रोग से छूटने के लिए प्रार्थना

हे सोम आर रुद्र ! रोग को इधर उधर उखाड़ फेंको जो हमारे घर में आ घुसा है। निर्ऋति को दूर परे हटा ले जाओ, किए हुए भी पाप को हमसे छुड़ा दो। (मंत्र १)

हे सोम और रुद्र ! इन सब औषधियों को हमारे शरीर में रक्खो, खोल दो और छुड़ा दो हमसे उस पाप को जो हमने किया है और हमारे शरीरों में बँधा हुआ है। (मंत्र २)

(2) Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 7, Sūkta 43

Pāp aur rog se chhūṭne ke liye prārthanā

He Sōma aur Rudra ! rōg kō idhar udhar ukhāṛ phainkō jō hamāre ghar men ā ghusā hai, Nirṛiti kō dūr pare haṭā le jāō, kiye hue bhī pāp kō hamse chhuṛā dō. (Mantra 1)

He Sōma aur Rudra ! īn sab aushadhiyōn kō hamāre śarīr men rakkhō, khōl dō aur chhuṛā dō hamse us pāp kō, jō hamne kiyā hai aur hamāre śarīrōn men bandhā huā hai. (Mantra 2)

---

1. This Sūkta has 8 Mantras and in the end of each Mantra the words "Burn all our sins" are repeated. In order to avoid increase in the volume of the book the translation of the first Mantra only has been given here.

Translation—

(2) Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 7, Sūkta 43

Prayer for being freed from Sin and Disease.

O Soma and Rudra! Disease which has entered our family may kindly be uprooted and cast away. Take the Nirṛiti[1] far away and free us from the sins we have already committed. (Mantra 1)

O Soma and Rudra! Put all these medicines in our body. Untie and then remove the sins which we have already committed and which are sticking to our bodies. (Mantra 2)

अथर्ववेद काण्ड ११, सूक्त ६

पाप, विपद् और दुख से रक्षा के लिए (देवताओं से प्रार्थना)

अग्नि, वनस्पतियों औषधियों और बूटियों, बृहस्पति और सूर्य से हम कहते हैं, हमें पाप से छुड़ावें। (मंत्र १)

राजा वरुण, मित्र, विष्णु, भग, अंश और विवस्वत से कहते हैं, वे हमें पाप से छुड़ावें। (मंत्र २)

सविता देव, धाता, पूषा से कहते हैं, और त्वष्टा से जो मुखिया है, वे हमें पाप से छुड़ावें। (मंत्र ३)

हम गंधर्वों, अप्सराओं, दोनों अश्वियों, ब्रह्मणस्पति (वेद के अधिपति) से जो देव अर्यमा प्रसिद्ध हैं उससे कहते हैं, वे हमें पाप से छुड़ावें। (मंत्र ४)

दिन रात से यह कहते हैं, सूर्य और चंद्र दोनों से, सारे आदित्यों से कहते हैं, वे हमें पाप से छुड़ावें। (मंत्र ५)

(3) Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 11, Sūkta 6

Pāp, vipad, aur dukh se rakshā ke liye (devatāon se Prārthanā)

Agni, vanaspatiyōn, aūshadhiyōn aur būṭiyōn, Bṛihaspati aur Sūrya se ham kahte hain, ke hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 1)

Rājā Varuṇa, Mitra, Vishṇu, Bhag, Anśa aur Vivasvata se kahte hain ve hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 2)

---

1. Goddess associated with Death. Destruction, calamity.

Savitā Dev, Dhātā, Pūshā se kahte hain, aur Tavashṭā se jō mukhiā hai, ve hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 3)

Ham Gandharvōn, Apsarāōn, dōnō aśviyōn, Brahmaṇaspati se jō Deva Aryamā prasiddh hain, us se kahte hain ve hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 4)

Din rāt se yeh kahte hain, Sūrya aur Chandra dōnō se, sāre ādityōn se kahte hain ve hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 5)

Translation —

(3) Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa 11, Sūkta 6

Prayer to gods for protection from sin, calamity and unhappiness

We pray to Agni, vegetables, medicines and medicinal plants and also to Bṛihaspati[1] and the Sun that they may free us from sins. (Mantra 1)

We pray to King Varuṇa[2], Mitra[3], Vishṇu, Bhaga[4], Anśa[5] and Vivasvata[6], that they may free us from sins. (Mantra 2)

We pray to god Savitā[7], Dhātā[8], Pūshā[9], and also to Tvashṭā[10] who is the chief among all of them that they may free us from sins. (Mantra 3)

We pray to Gandharvas, Apsaras[11], both the Aśvinis, Brahmaṇaspati[12] and also to famous god Aryamā[13] that they may all free us from sins. (Mantra 4)

We pray to Day and Night, and both to the Sun

1. Bṛihaspati is believed to be the priest of gods and god of wisdom and eloquence. 2. One of the most important gods. He is also said to be an Āditya, presiding over night. 3. One of the gods of the Āditya class, presiding over day. 4. One of the Ādityas, presiding over love and marriage, and bestower of wealth. 5. Name of an Āditya. 6. The Sun, sometimes an Āditya. 7. The Sun. 8. One of the gods, associated with the work of creation. Name of creator used in later Vedic literature. 9. A Vedic deity. 10. Name of a god, said to be the builder of divine implements etc. 11. Nymphs. 12. Another name of god Bṛihaspati. 13. Name of an Āditya.

and the Moon and to all the Ādityas that they may free us from sins. (Mantra 5)

There are 13 more *mantras* on the same subject. To avoid increase in the volume of the publication, the last *mantra* i.e. the 18th *mantra* only is now given[1] :—

आओ हे देवताओ ! दक्षिण से, पश्चिम से, आगे बढ़ते हुए, पूर्व से, उत्तर से, शक्ति वाले सारे देवता इकट्ठे होकर वे हमें पाप से छुड़ावें।

Āō he Devatāō ! dakshiṇa se, paśchim se, āge baṛhte huye, pūrva se, uttar se śaktiwāle sāre devatā ikaṭṭhe hōkar, ve hamen pāp se chhuṛāven. (Mantra 18)

Translation —

O Gods, come from the South and from the West, advancing forward and come from the East and from the North, all you gods who are powerful, collect together and free us from sins. (Mantra 18)

यजुर्वेद अध्याय ४०, मंत्र १६

हे अग्ने ! हमको धन की प्राप्ति के लिए सुमार्ग से ले जाइये। हमारे सब दोषों को जानते हुए आप हमारे बुरे पापों को नष्ट कीजिए। हम बार बार आपको नमस्कार करते हैं।

Yajur-Veda, Adhyāya 40, Mantra 16

He Agne ! ham kō dhan kī prāpti ke liye sumārg se le jāiye hamāre sab dōshōn kō jānte hue āp hamāre bure pāpōn kō nashṭ kījiye. Ham bār bār āpkō namaskār karte hain.

Translation —

O Agni ! lead us by the right path for the acquisi-

1. Note—Would anybody dare even now to say that there is no mention of the worship of gods in the Vedas ? It should be noted that the translation of the mantras of the Atharva-Veda is merely English translation of what was written by Pt. Raja Ram and the translation of the mantra of Yajur-Veda is based on the meaning given in Samskāra Prakāśa (page 188), the author of which is Mahāśaya Ram Gopal Vidyālankār of Gurukul Kāngṛī.

tion of wealth. While knowing all our faults, destroy our bad sins. We bow to you again and again.

153. On examining the arguments and researches of Swami Dayanand which have been referred to above, the Satsangi feels disturbed in his mind and becomes quite sure that Swami Dayanand had very little knowledge of *paramartha*. It is not for everybody to make a promise to give *pratyaksha pramana* in support of the existence of God and then to give only irrelevant proofs and thus avoid the issue. Similarly, it is not possible for an ordinary man to say that justice and mercy are synonymous and then obstinately to hold that God is only just and hence praise of God and prayers to Him are of no avail. Is it really the teaching of the *Vedic* religion that praise of God and prayers to Him are only one-sided activities i. e. they do not produce any effect at all on God and prayers etc. offered by man are not attended to at all by God? If the only result of praising God is that qualities, activities etc. get impressed on the heart of the person praising God and he is thus reformed, obviously God has had no hand in the matter. This result also is merely a direct consequence of the thoughts of the person praising God. Similarly, if the only result of offering prayers is that the person praying feels the glory and greatness of God and feelings of pride are removed from his heart and he feels encouraged, obviously God does not help in any way in this matter. This result also is the direct consequence of the thoughts of the person offering prayers. From this point of view, God does nothing for the person who praises Him or who offers prayers to Him. If His laws for punishment are fixed and nobody is spared punishment for his deeds, what has happened to those laws of God which are meant to reward persons for their good deeds? Is praising God or praying to Him not a *Karma*? Then why is there no reward for them? If it can happen in workshops in this world that the effect of acids is removed when soda

or alkali is put in any vessel containing the acid, is it not possible that true repentance and prayers for pardon may act like alkalis and neutralise the effect of man's bad actions which are like acid. And then what is this word '*Prayaśchitta*' in Sanskrit and what is its meaning? It perhaps means only "the effort to remove the sin" or does it mean anything else? If the Yājñavalkya Smriti with the Mitāksharā commentary (published by Venkateśvara Press Bombay) is referred to, the following words will be found in the commentary on Śloka 220 on page 341 :—

प्रायश्चित्तशब्दश्चायं पापक्षयार्थे नैमित्तिके कर्मविशेषे रूढः

Prāyaśchittaśabdaśchāyam pāpakshayārthe naimittike karmaviśeshe rūḍhaḥ.

Translation—

The word *prayaśchitta* has been used for that special act which is performed for the destruction of sins. If this is the meaning of the word *prayaśchitta*, how could it be then said that pardon for the sins of man is not possible and if pardon is really impossible, why is God called 'Merciful'? He may be called only 'Just'.

154. And have you ever thought over the meaning of the Urdu word 'انصاف' '*Insaf*' (Justice). The author of the Ghayās-ul-Lughāt writes :—

انصاف — به معنی نصف کردن و برابر داشتن که بر هیچ طرف زیادتی نه شود -

"Insāf—bamānī 'nisf kardan' va 'barābar dāshtan' ke bar hech taraf zyādatī na shavad."

Translation—

The meaning of the word '*insaf*' (justice) is 'to cut into two pieces and to keep the two pieces quite

equal to each other, so that no piece may be bigger than the other[1].

It would be evident from this meaning that '*insaf*' (justice) is always done between two parties. Thus the king does justice either between two individuals or between the criminal and the State of which the king himself is the representative. But among which parties does God do justice? Obviously one party is the offender and the other, He Himself. Does this mean then that God is also like a man who also has, like a king, some interest in the world? And when it is said that God created this creation merely for the benefit of the *Jivas*[1] and He has no other interest, the real nature of God would be liberality and mercy or grace, and not claiming against a *Jiva* an equal part as a party. And if the entire creation has been brought into existence by God Himself and according to Swami Dayanand, 'God wants good of all and also the happiness of all' and He is the sole master of the whole creation, what is the sense in His being called just? Who is that other party who has equal rights on account of which He has to do justice? Does He do justice between weak men and Himself? He creates the universe Himself, makes the laws of creation Himself and Himself punishes weak living beings and calls all this 'justice' so that He may be called 'just'. Did He not know at the beginning of the creation that the *Jivas* were weak and on account of their weaknesses they would again and again be committing faults? Knowing all this, His action in creating this universe in which weak *Jivas* get entangled and commit mistakes after mistakes and suffer punishment after punishment shows that in His innermost heart God wanted to enjoy the fun of exercising magisterial powers and for the satisfaction of this hidden and old desire of His, He has brought the whole creation into existence. Mercy! Mercy! Such thoughts about God are sacrilege.

---

1. Vide page 208 of Satyārtha Prakāśa, 4th Urdū Edition.

The Saints state that the Supreme Father is most Merciful. He is far above man's conception of both 'Mercy' and 'Justice'. Every action of His discloses His Greatest Mercy. When any *Jiva* sincerely and earnestly prays to Him, His Mercy begins to overflow. Man should never lose hope of mercy from Him, as is stated below :—

باز آ باز آ هر آں چه هستی باز آ -
گر کافر و گبرو بت پرستي باز آ -
ایں درگهه ما درگهه نومیدي نیست -
صد بار اگر توبه شکستي باز آ -

Bāz ā bāz ā har ān che hastī bāz ā.
Gar kāfir-ō-gabar-ō-butparastī bāz ā.
In dargāhe mā dargāhe naumedī nest.
Sad bār agar taubā shikastī bāz ā.

Translation —

Whosoever you may be, keep aloof, keep aloof from sins. You may be an infidel, a worshipper of Fire or an idol-worshipper, but keep aloof from sins. At this door, at My door, there is no disappointment. Even if you have broken your promise a hundred times, try to keep aloof from sins.

155. The subject matter of the 'Parable of the Vineyard' in the Bible may be recollected for a while. All the *Jivas* are the children of God. He wishes well of all His children. *Jivas* suffer troubles or have happiness, as a result of their *karmas*, but the merciful laws of God lead every *Jiva* towards his betterment. If any individual can take to the path of righteousness, when treated leniently, He provides lenient treatment for him. And if anybody compels Him to act harshly, He ordains harsh treatment for him. Those who praise Him, pray to Him and worship Him are treated in a special manner by Him. The owner of the vineyard engaged a certain man for work. All the labourers

came to receive their wages in the evening. The new labourer was given something more than the ordinary wage. Other labourers began to grumble. The master explained to them that it was improper for them to grumble, their wages had been fully paid to them and he had the right to pay anything, over and above the normal wage, to any person he likes. Exactly this is how the Merciful Laws of God work. *Bhakti* (i.e. devotion) is the best of all those activities which are considered as virtuous activities in this world and therefore devotees get greater reward than ordinary labourers. And according to Maulana Rumi :—

چوں بنالد زار بے شکرو گلا -
افتد اندر هفت گردون غلغله -

Chūn binālad zār be śukra-ō-gilā,
Uftad andar haft gardūn ghalghalā.

Translation—

When a devotee, not moved by any feelings of gratitude or thoughts of complaint, weeps himself out (out of sheer Love), great commotion takes place in all the seven heavens[1].

When any devotee influenced by deep feelings of love begins to weep, then all the seven heavens begin to tremble and God's mercy is showered on him in such a way that he begins to understand the sense in which God is known as Merciful. Those who are lovers of the Law of Punishment of God should peruse *Śloka* 2, Khanḍ 2, Munḍaka 2 of the Munḍaka Upanishad and should say what happens to this Law of Punishment when after achieving the *darśana* of *Brahma* all the knots of a man's heart are untied, all his doubts are removed and all his *karmas* are destroyed. The original *Śloka* is given here :—

---

1. According to Islam, there are 7 heavens in the creation. The expression 'all the seven heavens' thus means the entire creation.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः।
क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे॥ २-२-८॥

Bhidyate hṛidayagranthiśchhidyante sarvasanśayāḥ,
Kshīyante chāsya karmāṇi Tasmin dṛishṭe Parāvare. 2-2-8

Translation—

On seeing that Being Who is beyond everything else, the knots of the heart are untied, the doubts are all set at rest and the *karmas* are all destroyed. 2-2-8

156. And those who believe in the principle laid down by Swami Dayanand that the only result produced by prayers is that the person who prays, acquires humility, encouragement and a sense of being protected, may now answer what degree of humility, what kind of encouragement and protection would be received as a result of offering the following invocations and prayers given in the Sacred *Vedas*:—

अथर्व वेद काण्ड ६, सूक्त १०१

वाजीकरण

वृषा की नाईं आचरण कर, साँस ले, बढ़ और फैल। तेरा अंग, अंग अंग के अनुसार बढ़े। उससे तू स्त्री को प्रहार कर। (मंत्र १)

धनुष पर चिल्ले की तरह मैं तेरे अंग को तानता हूँ, सदा न मुरझाते हुए के साथ बारहसिंगी की ओर बारहसिंगे की नाईं जा। (मंत्र ३)

Atharva-Veda ,Kāṇḍa 6, Sukta 101[1]

Vājīkaraṇa

Vṛishā kī nāyīn ācharaṇ kar, sāns le, baṛh aur phail. Terā ang, ang ang ke anusār baṛhe. Us se tū strī kō prahār kar. (Mantra 1).

Dhanush par chille kī tarah main tere ang kō tāntā hūn. Sadā na murjhāte huye ke sāth bārahsingī kī ōr bārahsinge kī nāyīn jā. (Mantra 3).

---

1. The translation of all these mantras has been reproduced as given by Pt. Raja Ram in his Bhāshya of Atharva-Veda.

Translation —

Atharva-Veda, Kānda 6, Sukta 101

For increasing virility

Behave like a bull, breathe, grow and expand. Your *Anga* may develop proportionately with other parts of your body and you strike the woman with your *Anga*. (Mantra 1)

Just as the bow-string is made tight, I make your *Anga* tight. Always go like the he-antelope towards the she-antelope with that which is stiff and unyielding. (Mantra 3)

सूक्त १०२

स्त्री—वशीकरण

जैसे यह घोड़ा, हे अश्वियो ! साथ आता है और साथ रहता है, इस प्रकार मेरी ओर [हे कामिनि] तेरा मन साथ आवे और साथ रहे । (मंत्र १)

मैं तेरे मन को खैंचता हूँ, जैसे प्रधान घोड़ा पास वाली (घोड़ी) को । वातूल (वावरोले) से कटे तृण की तरह मुझ में तेरा मन लपेटा जाए वा चक्कर खाए । (मंत्र २)

Sūkta 102

Stri-Vaśikaraṇa

Jaise yeh ghōṛā, he Aśviyō, sāth ātā hai, aur sāth rahtā hai, is prakār merī ōr (he kāmini) terā man sāth āve aur sāth rahe. (Mantra 1)

Main tere man kō khainchatā hūn, jaise pradhān ghōṛā pās vālī (ghōṛī) kō. Vātūl (vāvrōle) se kaṭe tṛiṇ kī tarah mujh men terā man lapeṭā jāye vā chakkar khāye. (Mantra 2)

Translation —

Sūkta 102

For winning the affection of ladies

Just as this horse, O Aśvins, comes and goes with me, in the same manner, O lady, your mind may come towards me and remain with me. (Mantra 1)

I attract your mind just as the stallion attracts the mare standing by. Like the straw carried away by the whirlwind, may thy mind be engrossed in me and may it whirl round me. (Mantra 2)

सूक्त १३८

पुरुष विशेष को नपुंसक बना देने के लिए

हे औषधे ! तू औषधियों में सब से उत्तम विख्यात है, आज मेरे इस पुरुष को क्लीब ओपश (स्त्री-चिह्न) वाला बना दे । (मंत्र १)

इसको क्लीब बनादे, ओपश वाला और कुरीर वाला, तब इन्द्र दो पत्थरों से इसकी दोनों आंडियों को फोड़े । (मंत्र २)

देवताओं की बनाई जो तेरी दो नाड़ियाँ हैं, जिनमें तेरा वीर्य ठहरता है, तेरी उन दोनों को शम्या (लकड़ी) के साथ उस (स्त्री) के मुष्कों पर फोड़ता हूँ । (मंत्र ४)

Sūkta 138

Purush viśesh ko napunsak banā dene ke liye

He aushadhe ! tū aushadhiyōn men sab se uttam vikhyāt hai, āj mere is purush kō klīb ōpaś (strī-chihn) wālā banā de. (Mantra 1)

Is kō klīb banā de, ōpaś wālā aur kurīr wālā, tab Indra dō pattharōn se iskī dōnō āṇḍiyōn kō phōṛe. (Mantra 2)

Devtāōn kī banāyee jō terī dō nāṛiyān hain, jin men terā vīrya thehartā hai, terī un dōnōn kō śamyā (lakṛi) ke sāth us (strī) ke mushkōn par phōṛtā hūn. (Mantra 4)

Translation —

Sūkta 138.

For making a particular person impotent

O medicine, thou art well known as the best of medicines. Make this man (husband) of mine impotent and convert his male organ into that of a female. (Mantra 1)

Make this man impotent; change him into one having the female organ and one wearing a *kurira*[1].

1. A head-dress of ladies or lady's hair dressed in a particular style.

May Indra then break to pieces with two stones the two testicles of this man. (Mantra 2)

With a stick I make the two veins, made by gods which thou possessest and in which thy semen stays, burst on the private parts of that woman. (Mantra 4)

काण्ड ७, सूक्त ३६

शत्रु-स्त्री के विरुद्ध

तेरी.........के ऊपर के भाग को नीचे करता हूँ, न तुझे कन्या होवे, न ही पुत्र, तुझे न सूने वाली न सन्तान वाली बनाता हूँ। पत्थर को तेरा ढकना बनाता हूँ। (मंत्र ३)

Kāṇḍa 7, Sūkta 36.

Ṡatru strī ke viruddh

Teri...........[1] ke ūpar ke bhāg kō nīche kartā hūn, na tujhe kanyā hōve na hī putra, tujhe na sūne wālī, na santān wālī banātā hūn, patthar kō terā ḍhaknā banātā hūn. (Mantra 3)

Translation —

Kanda 7, Sukta 36.

Against the women of the enemy

I lower the upper part of your.........[1] Neither a girl nor a son may be born to you and I convert you into a woman who never gives birth to children and who has no issues. I make a tomb stone for you.

(Mantra 3)

काण्ड १२ सूक्त ५

ब्राह्मण की गौ

हे अंगिरस् की (पुत्री) ब्राह्मण के सताने वाले को क्षीण कर दे।

(मंत्र ५२)

Kāṇḍa 12, Sūkta 5

Brāhmaṇa ki Gau

He Angīras kī (putrī),[2] Brāhmaṇa ke satāne wāle kō kshīṇa kar de. (Mantra 52)

---

1. A shameful word. 2. Just consider what kind of belief there was in gods and goddesses !

Translation—

Kāṇḍa 12, Sūkta 5

The cow of a Brāhmaṇa

O Daughter of Agniras! Destroy him who harrasses the *Brahman*. (Mantra 52)

हे न मारने योग्ये! ब्राह्मण के सताने वाले, अपराध करने वाले, देवताओं के निन्दक, कंजूस के सिर को मार गिरा। (मंत्र ६०)

He na mārne yōgye! Brāhmaṇa ke satāne wāle, aparādh karne wāle, devatāōn ke nindak, kanjūs ke sir kō mār girā. (Mantra 60)

Translation—

O you who do not deserve to be destroyed! Those, who trouble the Brāhmans, commit sins, abuse gods and who are misers should be killed. (Mantra 60)

तुझ से मार डाले गए, मल दिए गए को, बुरी तरह चिने गए को अग्नि जला डाले। (मंत्र ६१)

Tujh se mār ḍāle gaye, mal diye gaye kō, burī tarah chine gaye kō, Agni jalā ḍāle. (Mantra 61)

Translation—

He who has been killed by thee and he who has been crushed by thee and he who has been built into the wall by thee, may all these be burnt by fire! (Mantra 61)

काट, काट डाल, टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दे, जला दे, जला डाल, जला कर राख कर दे। (मंत्र ६२)

Kāṭ, kāṭ ḍāl, ṭukṛe ṭukṛe kar de, jalā de, jalā ḍāl, jalā kar rākh kar de. (Mantra 62)

Translation—

Cut, cut them to pieces, make small pieces of them, burn them and burn till they are reduced to ashes. (Mantra 62)

ब्राह्मण के सताने वाले को हे देवि ! न मारने योग्ये ! जड़ से लेकर सारा जला कर राख कर दे। (मंत्र ६३)

Brāhmaṇa ke satāne wāle kō, he Devi ! na mārne yōgye ! jaṛ se lekar sārā jalākar rākh kar de. (Mantra 63)

Translation—

O goddess ! who deserves never to be killed ! He who troubles the Brāhman, may be burnt to ashes, every part of him. (Mantra 63)

सौ जोड़ों वाले, उस्तरों की नोकों वाले तीक्ष्ण वज्र के साथ।

(मंत्र ६६)

इसके कन्धे की हड्डियों को और सिर को मार गिरा। (मंत्र ६७)

Sau jōṛōn wāle, ustarōn kī nōkōn wāle, tīkshṇa bajjra ke sāth. (Mantra 66)

Iske kandhōn kī haḍḍiyōn kō aur sir kō mār girā. (Mantra 67)

Translation —

With the sharp *bajjra* which has 100 joints and which has sharp edges like razors. (Mantra 66)

Cut and destroy the bones of his shoulders and his head. (Mantra 67)

इसके लोमों को सारे छेद डाल, त्वचा को उधेड़ दे। (मंत्र ६८)

Iske lōmōn kō sāre chhed ḍāl, tvachā kō udheṛ de. (Mantra 68)

Translation—

Pierce through all the pores of his body and strip off his skin from the body. (Mantra 68)

इसके मांसों को टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दे, नाड़ियों को उखाड़ दे।

(मंत्र ६९)

Iske mānsōn kō ṭukṛe ṭukṛe kar de, nāṛiyōn kō ukhāṛ de. (Mantra 69)

Translation —

Cut the flesh of this man into pieces and detach all the veins of his body. (Mantra 69)

इसकी हड्डियों को पीड़ दे, इसकी चर्बी को मार निकाल। (मंत्र ७०)

Iskī haḍḍiyōn kō pīṛ de, iskī charbī kō mār nikāl. (Mantra 70)

Translation —

Crush the bones of this man and squeeze all the fat out of his body. (Mantra 70)

इसके सारे अंगों को, जोड़ों को अलग अलग करदे। (मंत्र ७१)

Iske sāre angōn kō jōṛōn kō alag alag kar de. (Mantra 71)

Translation —

Separate all the parts and the joints of his body. (Mantra 71)

कच्चा मांस खाने वाला अग्नि इसको पृथ्वी से धकेल दे, जला डाले, वायु बड़े फैले हुए अन्तरिक्ष से (धकेल दे, जला डाले) (मंत्र ७२)

Kachchā māns khāne wālā Agni iskō pṛithvī se dhakel de, jalā ḍāle, vāyu baṛe phaile hue antariksh se (dhakel de, jalā ḍāle) (Mantra 72)

Translation —

Fire which devours raw flesh may throw him away from the earth and burn him and the wind may throw him away from the very vast antariksh and burn him. (Mantra 72)

सूर्य इसको द्यौ से धकेल दे, जला डाले। (मंत्र ७३)

Sūrya iskō Dyau se dhakel de, jalā ḍāle (Mantra 73)

Translation —

The sun may throw him down from the Dyau[1] and burn him. (Mantra 73)

---

1. It was believed that the creation had three divisions, viz, Prithvī (earth), antariksha (the region between the earth and the sun) and Dyau (द्यौ), the highest region, the Region of gods.

157. How many more such invocations and prayers should be quoted? Some of the prayers are so obscene that it is very undesirable to reproduce them here. We shall content ourselves by giving only the headings of 12 Sūktas for the information of the readers, who may themselves then form an idea of the subject-matter of these Sūktas.

अथर्व वेद, काण्ड १

सूक्त १३—बिजली और ओलों से खेती आदि की रक्षा के लिए।

सूक्त १७—रुधिर के बहने को रोकने के लिए।

सूक्त २१—शत्रुओं के नाश के लिए (इन्द्र से प्रार्थना)।

सूक्त ३४—वर का अपनी ओर वधु के प्रेम का आकर्षण करने के लिये।

Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa I

Sūkta 13—Bijlī aur ōlōn se khetī ādi kī rakshā ke liye.
Sūkta 17—Rudhir ke bahne kō rōkne ke liye.
Sūkta 21—Śatruōn ke nāś ke liye (Indra se prārthanā).
Sūkta 34—Var kā apnī ōr vadhu ke prem kā ākarshaṇ karne ke liye.

Translation—

Atharva-Veda, Kāṇḍa I

Sūkta 13—For the protection of crops etc. against lightning and hail.
Sūkta 17—For preventing blood from flowing out.
Sukta 21—For the destruction of enemies (Prayer to Indra).
Sūkta 34—For winning the love of the bride by the bridegroom.

काण्ड ३

सूक्त १—शत्रुसेना को घबराहट में डालने, जीतने, और नाश करने के लिए।

सूक्त १८—सपत्नी (सौत) के विरुद्ध कर्म।

सूक्त २४—अनाज की बहुतात के लिए।

सूक्त २५—स्त्री के प्रेम को अपने वश में करने के लिए।

Kāṇda 3

Sūkta 1—Śatru senā kō ghabrāhat men ḍālne, jītne aur nāś karne ke liye.
Sūkta 18—Sapatnī ke viruddh karma.
Sūkta 24—Anāj kī bahutāt ke liye.
Sūkta 25—Strī ke prem kō apne vaś men karne ke liye.

Translation —

Kāṇḍa 3

Sūkta 1—For confusing the armies of the enemy, conquering them and destroying them.
Sūkta 18—Action against the co-wife.
Sūkta 24—For plentiful grain crops.
Sūkta 25—To win the love of a woman.

काण्ड ५

सूक्त २३—कृमियों (कीड़ों) के नाश के लिए।
सूक्त २६—पिशाचों के नाश के लिए।

Kāṇḍa 5

Sūkta 23—Krimiyōn ke nāś ke liye.
Sūkta 29—Piśāchōn ke nāś ke liye.

Translation —

Kāṇḍa 5

Sūkta 23—For destruction of insects.
Sūkta 29—For destruction of *Piśachas*[1].

काण्ड ६

सूक्त ३०—बालों के उगाने के लिए।
सूक्त ५६—सर्पों से रक्षा के लिए।

Kāṇḍa 6

Sūkta 30—Bālōn ke ugāne ke liye.
Sūkta 56—Sarpōn se rakshā ke liye.

---

1. A class of demons.

Translation —

Kāṇḍa 6

Sūkta 30—For ensuring the growth of hair.
Sūkta 56—For protection against snakes.

158. In short, the *Vedas* are full of such headings. Possibly this is the reason why now-a-days most of the Arya Samajists have lost faith in God, and their faith in respect of the *Vedas* being divine revelation has evaporated like camphor. When Swami Dayanand himself did not have faith in the repetition of the Holy Name of God, nor in praising God or in offering prayers to God and believed that everything depended on the ability of a person, naturally therefore the mind of his followers must be indifferent to God. In this connection the views of Shri Dev Sharma, Acharya Gurukul Kangri, reproduced below, may be perused[1].

(۱) شری دیو شرما آچاریہ گوروکل کانگڑی ایک مرتبہ گوروکل کرکشیتر میں تشریف لائے - اس وقت میں نے ان کے سامنے یہ پرشن رکھا کہ "اکثر لوگ ہم سے یہ پوچھتے ہیں کہ گوروکل کے اکثر سناتک ناستک ہوتے ہیں - اور ہمارے تجربہ میں بھی ایسا ہی پرتیت ہوا ہے - اس کا کیا کارن ہے ؟'

آچاریہ جی نے بڑی سنجیدگی کے ساتھ یہ اتر دیا - 'جب وید ہی ایسے ہوں تو اس کا کیا دوش ہے ؟'

اس پر میں نے پھر پوچھا کہ 'مہرشی دیانند جی پورن ویدوکتا - گیانی - ستہ وادی اور آپت پرش تھے - انہوں نے ہر جگہ اپنی بنائی ہوئی پستکوں میں ویدوں کو برہم گیان اور ستیہ ودیاؤں کا پستک مانا ہے اور آریہ سماج کے نیموں میں بھی بڑی تاکید کے ساتھ فرمایا ہے کہ ویدوں کا پڑھنا پڑھانا سب آریوں

1. This article was published on page 77 of the Arya Samajist news-paper Krānti, in July 1934. It is a signed article by Shri Banwari Lal, Secretary, Arya Partinidhi Upsabha, District Karnal and Ex-Principal of Gurukul Kurukshetra.

کا پرم دھرم ہے - اگر وید ایسے خراب اور ناستک پن پیدا کرنے
والے ہوتے تو مہرشی ہرگز ان کا پرچار نہ کرتے -'

آچاریہ جی کا اتر—'یہ اپنی اپنی رائے ہے - سوامی جی کی
رائے ایسی ہی ہے اور سناتکوں کی رائے مختلف ہے -'

(۲) شری دیو شرما جی آچاریہ جب دوسری مرتبہ گوروکل
کرکشیتر میں تشریف لائے تو سوامی دیوانند جی نے ہمارے
سامنے آچاریہ جی سے یہ پرشن کیا کہ 'کیا وجہ ہے کہ آپ کی
موجودگی میں گوروکلوں میں اکثر سناتک ناستک پیدا ہوتے ہیں؟'

آچاریہ جی کا اتر—'چونکہ گوروکلوں میں آجکل اکثر ادھیاپک
ناستک اور اویدک خیالات کے کام کرتے ہیں اسلئے سناتکوں کا
بھی ناستک اور اویدک خیالات ہونا لازمی ہے -'

"(1) Shri Deva Sharma, Āchārya, Gurukul Kāngrī, ek martabā Gurukul Kurukshetra men tashrīf lāye. Us vakt main ne unke sāmne yeh praśna rakkhā ke 'aksar lōg ham se yeh pūchhte hain ke Gurukul ke aksar snātak nāstik hōte hain aur hamāre tajrube men bhī aisā hī pratīt huā hai. Iskā kyā kāraṇ hai ?'

Achāryaji ne baṛī sanjīdgī ke sāth yeh uttar diyā' 'Jab Veda hī aise hōn tō iskā kyā dōsh hai ?'

Is par main ne phir pūchhā ke 'Maharshi Dayanand ji puran Vedavaktā, jñānī, satyavādī aur āpta purush the, unhōn ne har jagah apnī banāyee huyee pustakōn men Vedōn kō Brahma-jñāna aur satya vidyāōn kā pustak mānā hai aur Ārya Samāj ke niyamōn men bhī baṛī tāqīd ke sāth farmāyā hai ke Vedōn kā paṛhnā paṛhānā sab Āryōn kā param dharma hai. Agar Veda aise kharāb aur nāstikpan paidā karne wāle hōte tō Maharshi ji hargiz unkā prachār na karte.'

Āchāryaji kā uttar—'Yeh apnī apnī rāye hai. Swamiji kī rāye aisī hī hai aur snātakōn kī rāye mukhtalif hai.

(2) Shri Deva Sharma ji, Āchārya, jab dūsrī martabā Gurukul Kurukshetra men tashrīf lāye tō Swami Devanand ji ne hamāre sāmne Āchārya ji se yeh praśna kiyā ke 'kyā vajah hai ki āpkī maujūdgī men Gurukulōn men aksar snātak nāstik paidā hōte hain.'

Āchāryaji kā uttar—Chūnke Gurukulōn men āj kal aksar

adhyāpak nāstik aur avaidik khyālāt ke kām karte hain, is liye snātakōn kā bhī nāstik aur avaidic khyālāt hōnā lāzmi hai."

Translation —

Shri Deva Sharma Ācharya Gurukul Kangṛī, once paid a visit to Gurukul Kurukshetra. At that time I referred to him a matter that very often we were asked to explain why most of the graduates of the Gurukul were atheists and that my experience was also the same and enquired from him what was the cause of it.

Ācharya Shri Deva Sharma gave the following reply :—

"When the *Vedas* themselves are such, this attitude cannot be said to be wrong."

On this I said that Maharshi Dayanand was a perfect Vedic scholar, a learned man and an *Apta Purusha* and also wedded to truth. In all his writings he has accepted the *Vedas* as books containing divine knowledge and also true knowledge and even in the rules of Arya Samaj it has been emphasized that it is the highest duty of the Arya Samajists to study the *Vedas*. If the *Vedas* had been so bad as you say and liable to lead to atheism, Swami Dayanand would never have propagated their study etc.

Ācharya Shri Deva replied, "Everybody is free to have his own opinion. Swami Dayanand had this opinion but the opinion of the graduates of the Gurukul is different."

When Ācharya Shri Deva Sharma came over again, Swami Devanand put the following question to him in my presence :—

Question—'What is the reason that even when you are at the head of affairs there, the graduates of the Gurukul are generally atheists ?'

The Ācharya replied, 'Most of the teachers in the Gurukul these days are atheists and hold views which are not in conformity with the *Vedas*. As a result of this, the views of the graduates are also necessarily atheistic and opposed to the *Vedas*.

What can poor Satsangis say to all this !

چوں کفر از کعبه برخیزد کجا ماند مسلمانی -

Chūn kufr az kābā bar khezad kujā mānad Musalmānī.

Translation —

If blasphemy begins from the Ka'ba itself, where would Islam then exist ?

XX

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE VEDAS BEING ETERNAL

159. The Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā is also an authoritative book of Swami Dayanand and whenever any Satsangi gives expression to any difficulty of his regarding the *Vedas*, the Arya Samajists advise him to study this book. The reason is that this book, from the beginning to the end, is full of arguments based on the authority of books and also on reason. It therefore appears advisable that the arguments employed in this book may also be examined to some extent.

160. The subject of the *Vedas* being eternal has been discussed from page 18 to page 27 of the Urdu translation of this book. Swami Dayanand claims that as the *Vedas* contain knowledge revealed by God, they are eternal.

پڑھنے پڑھانے اور کتابوں کے فانی ھونے سے ویدوں کا فانی
ھونا ثابت نہیں ھوتا - کیونکہ وے ایشور کے گیان میں ھمیشہ

قائم و موجود رهتے هیں - جیسے اس کلپ کے اندر ویدوں میں
الفاظ - حروف و معني اور ان کا ربط موجود هے - اسی طرح پهلے
بهي تها اور آگے بهی اسي طرح هوگا کیونکه ایشور کے علم میں
غیرفانی هونے کي وجه سے کبهي فرق یا مغالطه نهیں هو سکتا -

Paṛhne paṛhāne aur kitābōn ke fānī hōne se Vedōn kā fānī hōnā sābit nahīn hōtā, kyōnke ve Īśvara ke jñāna men hameshā qāem va maujūd rahte hain. Jaise is Kalpa ke andar Vedōn men, alfāz, harūf va mānī aur unkā rabt maujūd hai, isī tarah pahle bhī thā aur āge bhī isī tarah hōgā, kyōnke Īśvara ke 'ilm men ghairfānī hōne kī vajah se kabhī farq yā mughāltā nahīn hō saktā.

Translation —

Though reading and teaching as well as books are non-eternal but this is no argument to prove that the *Vedas* are non-eternal because they always exist and are retained within the knowledge of God himself. Just as during this present Kalpa[1] there are words, letters, and meanings and also their fixed relationship in the *Vedas*, so it existed formerly also and it will continue to exist in the same manner in future as well because there could be no differences and doubts in the knowledge of God as they are eternal.

As proof of this statement Swami Dayanand has first quoted a *mantra* of Rig-Veda and has given the following meaning to it :—

سب کائنات کے قائم رکهنے والے پرمیشور نے سورج اور چاند
وغیره سب چیزوں کو مثل سابق بنایا هے -

'Sab kāenat ke qāem rakhne vāle Parmeśvara ne sūraj aur chānd vagairah sab chīzōn kō misl sābiq banāyā hai.

Translation —

God who maintains the entire creation has created

---

1. Kalpa is equal to 4,320,000,000 years of ours and is said to be one day of Brahma.

the sun and the moon etc. just as they were created by Him before. (Rig-Veda, 8-8-48.)

161. But in this *mantra*, the word '*Veda*' has not even been used at all. How could this *mantra* then be used to prove that the *Vedas* are eternal ? The original *mantra* and its literal meaning may now be considered. The *mantra* is—

सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथा पूर्वमकल्पयत् दिवं च पृथ्वीं चान्तरिक्षमथो स्वः ।

सूरज और चाँद दोनों, धाता यानी ब्रह्मा ने मिस्ल साबिक़ पैदा किये—द्यौ लोक, पृथ्वी, अन्तरिक्ष और स्वर्ग ।

Suryāchandramasau dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat,
Divam cha pṛithvīm chāntarikshamathō svaḥ. (R.V. 8-8-48)

Sūraj aur chānd dōnōn, Dhātā yānī Brahmā ne misl sābiq paidā kiye, Dyau Lōka, Pṛithvī, Antariksha aur Svarga.

Translation—

Both the sun and the moon were created by *Dhata* i.e. *Brahma* like before and so also, the *Dyau Loka*[1], *Prithvi*, *Antariksha*[2] and *Svarga*[3].

Here Swami Dayanand has interpreted the word '*Dhata*' not as *Brahma* but as *Parmeśvara* or God. There need be no objection to it. But when giving the substance of the *mantra* he mentions only the two spheres i.e. the Sun and the Moon and in place of other *Lokas* mentioned in the *mantra* he writes "etc. and all other things" and on this basis states that in this *mantra* the Sun and the Moon have been mentioned as examples, "just as one takes a handful of corn from a heap", and then he concludes that "just as in the first *Kalpa* the knowledge of the way, in which the Sun and the Moon etc. (i.e. the entire creation) were created, was present in the person of God and it exists so even in this

1. 'Dyau Loka' is the Region beyond the sun. 2. Vide Note 1 on page 84. 3. Vide Note 2 on page 26.

Kalpa, in the same manner, it should be believed[1] as regards the *Vedas* also". Obviously, the way he has drawn his conclusions is absolutely improper! When one comes across the words *'et cetera'*, in the meanings given by Swami Dayanand, one imagines that after the words 'Sun' and 'Moon' there is occasion for including other things as well, but when the correct meaning of the *mantra* are taken into consideration, it would appear that the author of the *mantra* wants to mention only about the creation of the six *Lokas*, viz, the *Sun*, *Moon*, *Dyau*, *Prithvi*, *Antariksha* and *Svarga* and that no one has the right to interpret the *mantra* in any way he likes by interpolating the word *'et cetera'*.

Further on he writes:—

اس موقع پر ویدوں کے غیرفانی ہونے کے متعلق ویاکرن
وغیرہ شاستروں کے حوالہ بطور شہادت لکھے جاتے ہیں -

"Is mauqe par Vedōn ke ghairfānī hōne ke muta'alliq vyākaraṇ vaghairah śāstrōn ke havāle bataur shahādat likhe jāte hain."

Translation —

Authority from grammar and other *Śastras* is now given here as evidence in support of the *Vedas* being eternal.

The Satsangi, disappointed with the quotations given from the *Vedas* naturally begins to expect the references to grammar and other *Śastras* and very gladly studies the reference to grammar first of all. Accordingly, the following reference comes to his notice :—

مہابھاشیہ کے مصنف پتنجلی منی‌جی کتاب مذکور کے پہلے
آھنک اور نیز کئی مقاموں پر لکھتے ہیں کہ جس قدر الفاظ
ویدوں میں آتے ہیں و نیز وہ الفاظ جو دنیا میں مشہور ہیں
سب غیرفانی ہیں - کیونکہ الفاظ کے اندر غیر متغیر - بے زوال

---

1. Rig-Vedādi Bhāshya Bhumikā, 1st Urdu Edition, Page 19.

غیر متحرک ۔ حذف نہ ہونے والے۔ ایزادی سے بری اور غیر مبدل
حروف ہوتے ہیں ۔

"Mahābhāshya ke musannif Patanjali Muniji kitāb mazkoor ke pahle Āhnika aur nīz kayee muqāmōn par likhte hain ke jis qadar alfāz Vedōn men āte hain ve nīz voh alfāz jō duniyā men mashhūr hain sab ghairfānī hain, kyōnke alfāz ke andar ghair mutghaiyyar, bezavāl, ghair mutaharrik, hazf na hōne wāle, īzādī se barī aur ghair mubaddal harūf hōte hain."

Translation—

Sage Patanjali, the writer of Mahābhāshya, has stated in the first *Ahnika* of the said book and also at many other places that all the words that are used in the *Vedas* and those words which are well known in the world are all eternal because the words contain letters which are unchanging, eternal, immovable and which cannot be dropped out or for which nothing else can be inserted and which cannot be exchanged.

162. On reading these words of Swami Dayanand, the difficulty of the Satsangi increases manifold and in bewilderment he cries out that this authority of Mahābhāshya establishes only that the letters and the words made up by their combination are eternal and does not refer at all to the *mantras* of the *Vedas* or their meaning. Millions of words are made through different combinations of letters of alphabets and all conversation in the world is carried on through these words. If the authority referred to above by Swami Dayanand is considered sufficient to prove that the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are eternal, it would also then be established that everything spoken by man in the world and at the same time the teachings of the Radhasoami Faith also are eternal.

163. After this Swami Dayanand refers to some more *Sutras* of grammar and closes his argument based on the authority of grammar in the following words:—

اس طرح زبان کے فعل اور تلفظ غائب اور موجود ہوتے رہتے

هیں نہ کہ بے زوال ہمیشہ اور یکساں رہنے والا لفظ - کیونکہ لفظ
سب جگہ موجود ہے اور ہر جگہ حاصل ہو سکتا ہے - جہاں ہوا اور
زبان کا فعل یا حرکت نہیں ہوتی وہاں تلفظ نہیں ہوتا - اور نہ
لفظ سنائی دیتا ہے - اس لئے لفظ آکاش کی طرح ہمیشہ غیرفانی ہے
اور ویاکرن کے مذکورہ بالا حوالوں سے تمام لفظوں کا غیرفانی ہونا
ثابت ہے - پھر وید کے لفظوں میں تو کلام ہی کیا ہے -

"Is tareh zabān ke f'el aur talaffuz ghāyab aur maujūd hōte rahte hain, na ke bezawāl hameshā aur yaksān rahne wālā lafz, kyōnke lafz sab jagah maujūd hai aur har jagah hāsil hō saktā hai. Jahān hawā aur zabān kā f'el yā harkat nahīn hōtī vahān talaffuz nahīn hōtā aur na lafz sunāyee detā hai. Is liye lafz akāśa kī tarah hameshā ghair-fānī hai aur vyākaraṇ ke mazkūrābālā havālōn se tamām lafzōn kā ghair-fānī hōnā sābit hai. Phir Veda ke lafzōn men tō kalām hī kyā hai."

Translation —

Thus the action of the tongue and the pronunciation of words disappear and new ones come into existence but not so the words which remain eternal and always the same because letters are present everywhere and can be got everywhere. Where there is no air and no action or movement by the tongue, there is no pronunciation and no word can be heard. Word, like ether, is therefore eternal and from the references of grammar mentioned above, all words are proved to be eternal. Under the circumstances, what doubt can there be about the words of the *Vedas* being eternal !

But according to this interpretation, the Name 'Radhasoami' and the book Yathārtha Prakāśa are both proved to be eternal and nobody can dare to say that the Name 'Radhasoami' is some recently invented name. But as a matter of fact, the conclusion drawn on the basis of the authority of grammar is wrong. The utmost that can be established from this is that words i.e. the *Śabdas* or sounds

are eternal. But no book (including the *Vedas*) is a mere collection of words. It is really a collection of ideas and the words of all the languages simply serve as clothing for the ideas of those persons who speak those languages. Thus, in order to establish that the *Vedas* are eternal, it is not sufficient to prove only that the words prevalent in the world are eternal. The knowledge present in the *Vedas* i.e. the meaning which can be deduced from the words used in the *Vedas* and the subjects dealt with therein should also be proved to be eternal.

164. After this, Swami Dayanand has quoted references from the Pūrva-Mīmānsā-Darśana of Sage Jaimini and the Vaiśeshika-Darśana of Sage Kaṇāda as authority. The meaning of the *Sutra* of Sage Jaimini is almost identical with the meaning of the *Sutra* quoted from the Mahābhāshya. Swami Dayanand has written the following meaning of the *Sutra* :—

فنا نہ ھونے سے لفظ تو غیرفانی ھي ھے کیونکہ اس کا ظہور
دوسروں کے لئے ھوتا ھے -

Fanā na hōne se lafz tō ghairfānī hī hai, kyōnke uskā zahūr dūsarōn ke liye hōtā hai."

Translation —

"The 'word', because it is not destroyed, is eternal as it manifests itself for the benefit of others."

In other words, Sage Jaimini also considers words only as eternal and does not say anything about the *Vedas* being eternal or not, and though in the *Sutra* of the Vaiśeshika Darśana the word '*Vedas*' has been used but there is no mention of that or anything else being eternal. The original *Sutra* may be perused :—

तद्वचनादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम्   १-१-३

Tadvachanādāmnāyasya prāmāṇyam.   1-1-3

Translation —

The *Vedas* are authoritative, because they have dealt with *Dharma.*

This is the third *Sutra* of the Vaiśeshika Darśana. In the first *Sutra* of this *Darśana*, Sage Kaṇāda says that from here onwards he would explain what is '*Dharma*'. And in the second *Sutra*, he presents the following definition of '*Dharma*':—

جس سے یتھارتھ اُنتی اور پرم کلیان کی سدھی ھوتی ھے وہ دھرم ھے ۔

"Jis se yathārtha unnati aur parama kalyāṇa kī siddhi hōtī hai, voh dharma hai."

Translation —

Dharma is that by which real progress and ultimate good is achieved.

After this definition of '*Dharma*', occurs the third *Sutra* i.e. the *Sutra* under discussion, which Swami Dayanand takes as authority for accepting the *Vedas* as eternal. But obviously, the meaning of this *Sutra* is quite different. Sage Kaṇāda says in this *Sutra* that the '*Dharma*' which has been defined by Him in the preceding *Sutra* or the '*Dharma*' which he proposes to explain has been dealt with in the *Vedas* also and therefore the *Vedas* stand as authority in providing proof in respect of '*Dharma*'. In other words, Sage Kaṇāda states in this *Sutra* that nobody should think that the definition of '*Dharma*' which he gave in *Sutra* No. 2 was imaginary. On the other hand, as there is mention of '*Dharma*' in the *Vedas* as well, Sage Kaṇāda claims that he has the authority of the *Vedas* for the definition he has given. But Swami Dayanand has given the following meaning to the *Sutra*:—

ایشور کا کلام ھونے اور دھرم اور ایشور کو بیان کرنے یعنی دھرم کرنا ھی فرض بتلانے اور ایشور سے ظاھر ھونے کی وجہ سے سب کو چاروں وید (آسنایہ) بے زوال ماننے چاھیئں ۔

Īśvara kā kalām hōne aur Dharma aur Īśvara kō bayān karne yānī Dharma karnā hī farz batlāne aur Īśvar se zāhir hōne kī vajah se sabkō chārōn Veda (āmnāye) bezavāl mānane chāhiyen.

Translation —

All persons should accept the Four *Vedas* as eternal. because they are the word of God, and they describe '*Dharma*' and God, i.e. they state that the performance of '*Dharma*' was man's duty and that the *Vedas* had been revealed by God.

It is not understood from where Swami Dayanand got the interpretation that the four *Vedas* should be accepted as eternal and which word in the *Sutra* can be interpreted as meaning 'eternal'. Pt. Raja Ram in his translation of the Vaiśeshika Darśana in Hindi has given a foot-note on page 11, after giving the meaning of the *Sutra*' and in that he has written that some commentatators have interpreted the word 'tat' as God, and thereby interpreted the entire *Sutra* as below :—

اس جگت پرسدھ ایشور نے پرتیپادن کیا ھے اسلئے وید کا پرامانیہ ھے -

"Us Jagat-prasiddh Īśvara ne pratipādan kiyā hai, is liye Veda kā prāmāṇya hai."

Translation —

Because God, known all over the world, has created the *Vedas*, they are therefore considered authoritative.

In other words, because it is admitted that God has manifested the *Vedas* and the *Vedas* contain description of that '*Dharma*' which he proposes to deal with, Sage Jaimini says that the definition of '*Dharma*' given by him should be considered as authoritatative according to the *Vedas*. But even this meaning, though arrived at after much stretching of the sense of the words, does not help in any way in

establishing that the *Vedas* are eternal. Admitting for a moment that the *Vedas* are God-made and '*Dharma*' has been described in them, how are these things related to the *Vedas* being eternal ?

165. Now comes the turn of Nyāya Darsana and *Sutra* No. 68, *Adhyaya* 2 *Ahnika* I is referred to. This authority is also quite irrelevant. The original *Sutra* is :—

मन्त्रायुर्वेद प्रामाण्यवच्च तत्प्रामाण्यमाप्त प्रामाण्यात् २-१-६८

Manträyurveda prämāṇyavachcha tatprāmāṇyamāpta-prāmāṇyät. 2—1—68

Translation—

The authority of the *Vedas* is as evidently imperative as the authority of *mantras* and *Ayurveda*, because the words of the *Apta Purushas* are accepted as authoritative.

After giving the *Sutra*, Swami Dayanand has given the commentary of Sage Vātsyāyana, but in this commentary as well there is no mention of the *Vedas* being eternal. The meaning of the *Sutra* may now be considerd.

This *Sutra* is really an answer to a question. If the question is grasped correctly, the meaning of the *Sutra* can be properly understood. The question is :—

क्या शब्द के प्रमाणत्व दूर करने वाले हेतुओं के खंडन करने ही से शब्द की प्रमाणता सिद्ध हो जायगी ?

"Kyā śabda ke pramāṇatva dūr karne wāle hetuōn ke khaṇḍan karne hī se śabda kī pramāṇatā siddh hō jāyegi ?"

Translation—

Will the authority of '*Śabda*' be established merely by demolishing those causes which go against the authority of the '*Śabda*' ?

In other words, the author of Nyāya Darśana has so far criticized all those things which were opposed to the authority of the *'Śabda'* being accepted and therefore the question was raised whether the authority of the *'Śabda'* will be established merely by criticizing those things which stood in the way of the authority of the *'Śabda'* being established. The reply of this question is given in *Sutra* 68.

मंत्र (शब्द-शक्ति विशेष) और आयुर्वेद (वैद्यक) इनकी प्रमाणता की नाईं वेद का भी प्रमाण होना (आप्त के प्रमाणत्व से) सिद्ध है।

"Mantra (Śabda-Śakti, viśesha) aur Āyurveda (Vaidyak) inkī pramāṇatā kī nāīn Veda kā bhī pramāṇa hōnā (Apta ke pramāṇatva se) siddh hai."

Translation —

Just as the *Mantras*[1] and *Ayurveda* are accepted as authority because they contain the words of *Apta Purushas*, so the *Vedas* also, being the words of *Apta Purushas*, should be accepted as authority.

In other words, as the exact result of those *mantras* which remove the effect of poison and evil spirits etc. can be clearly seen on using them and as the exact result of medicines mentioned in the books of Medical science is correctly noticed when they are used, similarly the *Vedas* and other true *Śastras* should be accepted as authority, being the words of *Apta Purushas*. When the *mantras* of *Apta Purushas* for removing the effect of poison etc. and the medicines prescribed by *Apta Purushas* prove to be efficacious in human experience and are therefore considered authoritative, naturally then the words of the *Vedas* and other true *Śastras*, being the words of *Apta Purushas* should also be accepted as authoritative, for on examining one grain of rice from a boiling kettle we judge whether the whole quantity of rice in the kettle is properly boiled or not. Readers may now consider in what manner does this *Sutra*

1. Particular Śabdas which have peculiar force and efficacy (unconnected with their meaning) in themselves or in their mere repetition or sound.

have any connection with the *Vedas* being Eternal. The question here was only whether the *Vedas* are authoritative or not and not whether they are eternal or non-eternal.

166. But Swami Dayanand draws inference from this *Sutra* only according to his own wish. The original words of Swami Dayanand are :—

اس سے یہ منشا ھے کہ جس طرح راستی شعار عالم کا قول
بہ منزلہ شبد پرمان سند گردانا جاتا ھے اسی طرح ویدوں کو بھی
سراپا راستی شعار عالم کل ایشور کا کلام ھونے سے مستند ماننا
چاھئے کیونکہ کل راستی شعار عالموں نے اس کو سند مانا ھے پس
ایشور کا علم ھونے سے ویدوں کا غیرفانی ھونا ثابت ھے -
(رگ ویدادی بھاشیہ بھومکا - پہلا اردو ایڈیشن - صفحہ ۲۲)

"Is se manshā hai ki jis tarah rāstishuār ālim kā qaul bamanzila śabda pramāṇa sanad gardānā jātā hai isī tarah Vedōn kō bhī sarāpā rāstīshuār Ālime Kul Īśvara kā kalām hōne se mustanad mānnā chāhiye, kyōnke kul rāstīshuār ālimōn ne uskō sanad mānā hai. Pas Īśvara kā 'ilm hōne se Vedōn kā ghairfānī hōnā sābit hai."

Translation —

The object here is that just as the words of *Apta Purushas* are accepted as *Śabda Pramana* i.e. authoritative, similarly the *Vedas* also should be accepted as authoritative because they are the words of God Who is the highest amongst *Apta Purushas* and also because all *Apta Purushas* have accepted them as authoritative. Therefore the *Vedas* being the knowledge of God are proved to be eternal.

(Rigvedādi Bhāshya-Bhūmikā, 1st Urdu Edi. P. 22)

Swami Dayanand says that just as the words of every *Apta Purusha* are accepted as authoritative, similarly the words of God should be accepted as authoritative because God is the greatest *Apta Purusha* and also because *Apta Purushas* of the world accept it as authority. So far

the statement of Swami Dayanand is quite understandable but how can the conclusion that the *Vedas* are eternal because of their being the knowledge of God be drawn from the above, particularly when the *Sutra* does not mention that the *Vedas* are made by God, and the only thing stated there is that people should accept the *Vedas* as authority because *Apta Purushas* have accepted the *Vedas* as authoritative.

167. After this, the authority of Yoga Darsana has been referred to and this also is as irrelevant as the authority from Nyāya Darsana, He writes on page 22, Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, 1st Urdu Edition :—

ایشور جو قدیم بزرگوں یعنی اگنی - وایو - آدتیہ - انگرا
اور برھما وغیرہ کا (جو دنیا کے شروع میں ھوے) اور نیز ھم
لوگوں اور ان کا جو آگے ھونگے سب کا گورو (گورو - گری مصدر
سے بنتا ھے جس کے معنی بولنا ھے پس جو بہ ذریعہ وید سچی
باتوں کی ھدایت (اپدیش) کرتا ھے وھی ایشور گورو ھے) اور
ھمیشہ غیرفانی ھے کیونکہ وہ وقت کی گرفت سے باھر ھے -
(پاتنجل یوگ درشن - ادھیائے ۱ - پاد ۱ - سوتر ۲۶)

Īśvara jō qadīm buzurgōn yānī Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, Āngirā aur Brahmā vaghairah kā (jō duniyā ke śurū men hue) aur nīz ham lōgōn aur unkā jō āge hōnge sabkā Guru—(Guru 'Gṛī' masdar se bantā hai jiske mānī 'bōlnā' hai, pas jō ba zariye Veda sachchī bātōn kī hidāyat (upadesh) kartā hai vohī Īśvara Guru hai) aur hameshā ghairfānī hai, kyōnke voh vaqt kī girift se bāhar hai.
(Yōga Darśana of Patanjali, Adhyāya 1, Pāda 1, Sūtra 26).

Translation —

God Who is the Guru (the word Guru is formed from the root गृ 'Gṛī' which means 'to speak' and hence God Who gives discourses about truth through the *Vedas*, is Guru) of all ancients (i.e. *Agni*, *Vayu*, *Aditya*, *Angira* and *Brahma* etc. (who existed in the beginning of the creation) and also of ourselves and also of those who will come hereafter and Who is always eternal

because no time restrictions apply to Him.
(Yoga Darśana of Patanjali, Adhyāya I, Pāda I, Sūtra 26).

But as has been stated above, there is no indication at all in the *Sutra* itself about the *Vedas* being eternal. The *Sutra* is given below :—

स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात् (२६)

Sa Pūrveshāmapi Guruḥ kalenānavachchhedāt (26)

Translation —

God, not being limited by time, is the Guru of all ancient sages also.

Obviously, this *Sutra* has referred to the two qualities of God, first, that of His being free from time restrictions and secondly, of His being the Guru of even the most ancient Sages. It is correct that the word 'Guru' is formed from the root 'गॄ' 'Gṛī' which means 'to speak' and from this point of veiw, the meaning of the word 'Guru' would be 'One who teaches' and it is also not denied by anybody that God is the Teacher of all the people and He is Eternal. But how are these statements connected with the *Vedas* being eternal or non-eternal? As a matter of fact, if such arguments and such reasoning had been made use of in any book of the Religion of Saints, one does not know what words would have been used by Swami Dayanand regarding that book and its author and how vehemently Arya Samajists would have criticized the followers of the Religion of Saints but now because it refers to their own case, no Ārya Samājist speaks a word and according to the saying of Swami Dayanand himself '*Baba vakyam pramanam*' i. e. 'words of the grand-father are authoritative', the whole society is acting on this principle.

168. After referring to the authority of the *Yoga*

Darśana, the authority of the *Samkhya Darśana* and the *Vedanta Darśana* has been given as was expected. Readers who have so far put up with irrelevant references would, it is hoped, not mind going through these two references also. After quoting *Sutra* 51, *Adhyaya* 5 of *Samkhya Darśana*, Swami Dayanand has explained it as below:—

ویدوں کا ظہور ایشور کی خاص قدرت سے ہونے کے باعث
یعنی پرش (ایشور) کی طبعی یا ذاتی قدرت کاملہ سے ویدوں کا
ظہور ہونے کی وجہ سے ویدوں کو بنفہم مستند (سوتہ پرمان) اور
غیرفانی ماننا چاہئے -

(رگ ویدادی بھاشیہ بھومکا - پہلا اردو ایڈیشن صفحہ ۲۳)

"Vedōn kā zahoor Īśvara kī khās qudrat se hōne ke bāyas yānī Purusha (Īśvara) kī taba'yee yā zātī qudarat-e-kāmilā se Vedōn kā zahoor hōne kī vajah se Vedōn kō binfaham mustanad (svataḥ pramāṇa) aur ghair-fānī mānanā chāhiye"

(Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, 1st Urdu Edition, Page 23).

Translation —

As the *Vedas* were revealed through the inherent Divine Powers of God i.e. because of the Ever-present Omnipotence of God, they should be accepted as authoritative in themselves and also as eternal.

But is it possible for any person who is even slightly acquainted with the Sāmkhya Darśana to believe that it could have been stated in Sāmkhya Darśana that the *Vedas* were revealed by God? He would most surely think that the Sāmkhya *Sutra* in question has some other meaning. The original *Sutra* is :—

निजशक्त्यभिव्यक्तेः स्वतः प्रामाण्यम्

Nijśaktyabhivyakteḥ svataḥ prāmāṇyam. 5—51

Translation—

The *Vedas* transmit true knowledge automatically because of their own inherent power.

The literal meaning of the *Sutra* is: "Because of the manifestation of their natural power, the self-authoritativeness of the *Vedas*." In other words, because the *Vedas* have inherent power to convey true knowledge, their self-authoritativeness is established. How unjust is this? Sage Kapila tries to establish from the *Sutra* that the *Vedas* are self-authoritative, whereas Swami Dayanand infers from the *Sutra* that the *Vedas* were produced by the special Divine Powers of God and are eternal.

169. Swami Dayanand has referred to *Śutra* 3, *Pada* 1, *Adhyaya* 1, of the Vedānta Darśana also which is given below :—

शास्त्रयोनित्वात्

Śāstrayōnitvāt 1—3—1

Translation —

From the authority of the *Śastras* etc., *Brahma* is found to be the cause of the manifestation of the creation.

The commentators have given two interpretations of the *Sutra*. First, that according to the authority of the *Śastras, Brahma* is found to be the original cause of the manifestation of the creation and secondly, that the *Śastras* are the source of the knowledge of *Brahma*. In other words, as water hidden in the mountains becomes manifest in a spring, similarly *Brahma* Who is hidden in everything in this creation becomes manifest in the *Śaśtras*. Therefore the *Śastras* are the source of *Brahma* but Swami Dayanand has explained the *Sutra* in the following manner :—

رگ وغیرہ چاروں وید جو ہر قسم کے علوم کے مخزن ہیں
اور مثل آفتاب کل مطالب و معنی کو روشن کرتے ہیں اور تمام
علوم کی کان ہیں ان کا مخرج (یونی) یا مسبب (کارن) برہم ہے -

Rig-Veda vagairah chārōn Veda jō har qism ke 'ulūm kā makhzan hain aur misl āftāb kul matālib va mānī kō rōshan karte hain aur tamām 'ulūm kī kān hain, unkā makhraj (yōni) yā musabbab (kāran) Brahma hai'.

Translation —

The source and the cause of the four *Vedas*, including the *Rig*-*Veda* etc., which are the fountain-head of all kinds of knowledge and which, like the sun, clearly disclose their purport and meaning and which are the mine of all knowledge, is *Brahma*.

It may be admitted that the meaning given by Swami Dayanand is correct but even by accepting this meaning as correct, the only conclusion that we can draw is that the origin of the *Vedas* is *Brahma*. How is it established from this that the *Vedas* are eternal? *Brahma* is the origin or source of the entire creation also, but the creation is not eternal.

170. The eighth proof given by Swami Dayanand is from the *Vedas* themselves and in this connection, he has referred to the following *mantra* of *Yajur Veda* :—

स पर्य्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणमस्नाविरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम् ।
कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः
समाभ्यः ॥ यजुर्वेद अ० ४० मं० ८ ॥

Sa paryyagāchchhukramakāyamavraṇamasnāviram śuddham apāpaviddham,
Kavirmanīshī paribhūḥ svayambhūryāthātathyatō arthān vyadadhāchchhāśvatībhyaḥ samābhyaḥ. (Yajur-Veda 40—8)

This *mantra* has been translated by Pt. Jaya Deva Sharma in his Hindi Bhāshya as below :—

"(सः) वह परमेश्वर (परि अगात्) सर्व व्यापक है। वह (शुक्रम्) शुद्ध, कान्तिमय, अथवा तीव्र शक्तिमय, शीघ्र गति देने वाला, (अकायम्) स्थूल, सूक्ष्म और कारण तीनों शरीरों से रहित, (अव्रणम्)

व्रण या घाव आदि से रहित, (अस्नाविरम्) स्नायु आदि बन्धनों से रहित, (शुद्धम्) अविद्या आदि दोषों से रहित, सदा पवित्र, (अपापविद्धम्) पापों से सदा मुक्त, (कविः) क्रान्तदर्शी, मेधावी, (मनीषी) सबके मनों को प्रेरणा करने वाला, (परिभूः) सर्वत्र व्यापक सब का वशयिता, (स्वयम्भूः) स्वयं अपनी सत्ता से सदा विद्यमान, माता पिता द्वारा जन्म न लेने हारा है। वह (याथातथ्यतः) यथार्थरूप से, ठीक ठीक (शाश्वतीभ्यः) सनातन से चली आयीं (समाभ्यः) प्रजाओं के लिए (अर्थान्) समस्त पदार्थों को (वि अदधात्) रचता है। और उनका ज्ञान प्रदान करता है।"

"(Sah) Voh Parameśvara (pari agāt) sarvavyāpak hai. Voh (śukram) śuddha, kāntimaya, athvā tībra śaktimaya, śīghra gati dene wālā, (akāyam) sthūl, sūkshma aur kāraṇa tīnōn śarīrōn se rahit, (avraṇam) vraṇa yā ghāv ādi se rahit, (asnāviram) snāyu ādi bandhanōn se rahit, (śuddha) avidyādi dōshōn se rahit, sadā pavitra, (apāpaviddham) pāpōn se sadā mukta (kaviḥ) krānta-darshī, medhāvī, (manīshī) sabke manōn kō preraṇā karne wālā, (paribhūḥ) sarvatra vyāpak sabkā vaśayitā, (svayambhūḥ) svyam apnī sattā se sadā vidyamān, mātā pitā dvārā janm na lene hārā hai. Voh (yāthātathyataḥ) yathārtha rūp se, ṭhīk ṭhīk (śāśvatībhyaḥ) sanātan se chalī āyee (samābhyah) prajāōn ke liye (arthān) samast padārthōn kō (vi adadhāt) rachtā hai. Aur unkā jñāna pradān kartā hai.

Translation —

That God is omnipresent. He is pure, luminous, possesses great energy and is capable of causing great movement, is free of all three kinds of bodies i.e. physical, subtle and causal, free from wounds etc., free from all entanglements like nerves etc., free from ignorance and other shortcomings etc., eternally pure, eternally free from sins, possessing knowledge of the beyond, intelligent, inspirer of the minds of all, omnipresent and Who controls everything and everybody and Who exists by His own innate power and Who is not born of father and mother. He creates all the things in proper form for the benefit of *Jivas* and things that

have existed since the beginning and also provides knowledge about them.

171. If some person takes hold of even a microscope and examines this *mantra* and its meanings minutely, he would not find therein even a trace of the word '*Veda*' and the word '*nitya*' (i.e. eternal). But Swami Dayanand after correctly giving the literal meaning of the first part of the *mantra* has added new ideas beginning with the word 'Śāśvatībhyah' which word has been translated by Pt. Jaya Deva Sharma as 'coming from ancient times'. Swami Dayanand has thus given the meaning of this *mantra* as below:—

"उसने सृष्टि की आदि में अपनी प्रजा को जो कि उसके सामर्थ्य में सदा से वर्तमान है, उसके सब सुखों के लिए (अर्थान् व्यदधात्) सत्य अर्थों का उपदेश किया है"

"Usne srishṭi kī ādi men apnī prajā kō jō ke uske sāmarthya men sadā se vartmān hai uske sab sukhōn ke liye (arthān vyadadhāt) satya arthōn kā updeśa kiyā hai."

Translation—

In the beginning of the creation, He (God) taught to the *Jivas* who were eternally present within Him, things that were ever true[1], so that all happiness may be secured to them.

And further on he has added the following words:—

"इसी प्रकार जब जब परमेश्वर सृष्टि को रचता है तब तब प्रजा के हित के लिए सृष्टि की आदि में सब विद्याओं से युक्त वेदों का भी उपदेश करता है और जब जब सृष्टि का प्रलय होता है तब तब वेद उसके ज्ञान में सदा बने रहते हैं। इससे उनको सदैव नित्य मानना चाहिए।"

"Isī prakār jab jab Parmeśvara srishṭi kō rachtā hai tab tab prajā ke hit ke liye srishṭi kī ādi men sab vidyāōn se yukta Vedōn kā bhī updeśa kartā hai aur jab jab srishṭi kā pralaya hōtā hai,

1. Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, 3rd. Hindi Edition, Page 37.

tab tab Veda uske jnāna men sadā bane rahte hain. Is se unkō sadaiva nitya mānanā chāhiye."

Translation —

Whenever God brings the creation into being, He imparts, in the beginning of the creation and for the good of the *Jivas*, knowledge of the *Vedas* which includes all kinds of knowledge and whenever the creation is dissolved, the *Vedas* continue to exist as a part of His knowledge. One should therefore always accept the *Vedas* as eternal.

On reading the above additional sentences the astonishment of a Satsangi knows no limits. Swami Dayanand promises to prove a certain thing and produces authority from the *Vedas* in its support, but in the authority quoted there is no mention of the thing concerned. The *mantra* contains the words '*arthan vyaddhat*' the meaning of which is "that He creates all the substances and the things of the world." Swami Dayanand just catches hold of these words and whatever he had to establish, he tries to prove by giving the meanings of these words and he feels satisfied that he has proved the fact of the *Vedas* being eternal by quoting the authority of the *Vedas* and in this connection he also adds of his own accord the following words:—

"सब विद्याओं से युक्त वेदों का भी उपदेश करता है और जब जब सृष्टि का प्रलय होता है तब तब वेद उसके ज्ञान में सदा बने रहते हैं।"

"Sab vidyāōn se yukt Vedōn kā bhī updeśa kartā hai aur jab sṛishṭi kā pralaya hōtā hai tab tab Veda uske jñāna men sadā bane rahte hain."

Translation —

God imparts the knowledge of the *Vedas* which are full of all knowledge and whenever there is dissolution of the creation, the *Vedas* continue to exist as a part of His knowledge.

172. After quoting the authority from the *Śastras* i.e. after giving quoted evidence,[1] Swami Dayanand has produced two rational arguments also which are even more surprising. He says that it is a law that if there is a tree which has no root, it cannot have branches, flowers and fruits etc., e.g., it is impossible that the marriage of the son of a barren woman could be witnessed.

اُسی طرح یہاں بھی غور کرنا چاھئے که اگر ایشور میں
غیر متناھیعلم نه ھوتا تو وہ کس طرح الہام (اپدیش) کرسکتا اور
اگر وہ الہام نه کرتا تو کسی انسان میں بھی علم کا نشان نه
پایا جاتا ۔'

"Isī tarah yahān bhī ghaur karnā chāhiye ke agar Īśvara men ghair-mutnāhī 'ilm na hōtā tō voh kis tarah ilhām (upadeśa) kar saktā, aur agar voh ilhām na kartā tō kisī insān men bhī 'ilm kā niśān na pāyā jātā."

Translation —

Similarly, it should be borne in mind that if God had not possessed infinite knowledge, how could He have inspired men with His knowledge and if He had not revealed His knowledge, it would not have been possible for any man to have any knowledge.

In other words, Swami Dayanand means to say that the present knowledge in the world is like the branches, flowers and fruits. This tree of knowledge should also have its root in the infinite knowledge of God. After this, Swami Dayanand gives another argument which is as follows:—

'ھر انسان کو وھی بات جس کا اسے واقعی تجربه ھوتا ھے
(یا جس کو وہ موجودہ یا سابقه جنم میں بھگتے ھوئے ھوتا ھے)
سوجھتی یعنی اس کے دل سے ابھرتی یا پیدا ھوتی ھے - یعنی جس
چیز کا بذریعه علم الیقین (پرتیکش) تجربه ھو چکتا ھے اسی کا
اثر (سنسکار) قائم رھتا ھے........پس اگر دنیا کے شروع میں

1. Evidence which was given in support of the author's arguments and which consisted of quotations from other books.

ایشور کا اپدیش (الہام) اور تعلیم و ھدایت نہ ھوتی - تو کسی شخص کو بھی علم کا انوبھو نہ ھوتا - پھر (انوبھو کے بغیر) اس کا اثر یا خیال (سنسکار) بھی نہ ھوتا اور اثر یا خیال کے بغیر یاد کہاں سے رھتا - اور یاد کے بغیر کسی کو ذرا بھی علم نہیں ھو سکتا ۔'

"Har insān kō vahī bāt jiskā use vāqa'yee tajurbā hōtā hai (yā jiskō voh maujūdah yā sābiqah janm men bhugate hue hōtā hai) sūjhtī yānī uske dil se ubhārtī yā paidā hōtī hai. Yānī jis chīz kā bazariye 'ilm-ul-yaqīn tajurbā hō chuktā hai usī kā asar qāim rahtā hai..................pas agar duniyā ke śurū men Īśvara kā updeśa aur tālīm va hidāyat na hōtī, tō kisī shakhs kō bhī 'ilm kā anubhav na hōtā. Phir uskā asar yā khyāl bhī na hōtā aur asar yā khyāl ke baghair yād kahān se rahtā, aur yād ke baghair kisī kō zarā bhī 'ilm nahīn hō saktā."

Translation —

Only that thing of which a man has direet personal experience (or which he had experienced either in this life or in his previous life) suggests itself to him or crops up in his mind. In other words, the impression of only that thing of which he had direct perception continues to exist in his mind ....Thus, if in the beginning of creation God's inspiration, His teachings and His guidance had not been available to man, nobody could have obtained any knowledge and thus he could not have had any impression on the mind and in its absence, he could not have remembered anything, and when a thing is not retained in memory, he cannot possibly have any knowledge about it."[1]

It may be admitted not only once but a hundred times that in the beginning of creation, God imparted knowledge and that knowledge was the knowledge contained in the *Vedas* and all the knowledge which is available in the world these days is nothing but the branches, flowers and fruits of the

1. Ṛigvedādi Bhāṣhya Bhūmikā, 1st. Urdu Edition, page 25.

knowledge in the *Vedas* but our question was whether the knowledge of the *Vedas*, their words, their meaning and their usage are eternal or non-eternal. An answer to this question is still due.

Swami Dayanand had claimed that the *Vedas* are eternal and had allotted one whole chapter in the book Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā for discussion on this subject. But if the only argument he had in support of his claim was that 'as the *Vedas* are the knowledge of God, they are eternal', it is not understood why he dealt with the subject at such great length, unnecessarily dragged in the authority of the *Rig-Veda* and the *Yajur-Veda* and equally unnecessarily referred to Mahābhāśya, Vyākaraṇa, Pūrva Mīmānsā, Vaiśeshikā, Nyāya, Yoga, Sāmkhya and Vedānta *Śastras*. He could have easily finished his argument merely by stating that he considered the *Vedas* as eternal because they contained the knowledge of God. But on the other hand, he tried to produce 10 or 12 arguments in support of his contention and the surprise is that all his arguments are irrelevant and all the arguments given in favour of the *Vedas* being eternal are sterile and as non-existent as the son of a barren woman. The Satsangi enquires with great humility why have the *Vedas*, if they are really eternal, disappeared from the world now. The *Vedas* are said to have 1131 *Śakhas*. How many of these are available now ? The reply to this may be that even if the *Śakhas* have been lost, it does not matter as the original *Vedas* are avilable. But where are the original *Vedas* ? The *Yajur-Veda* accepted as authoritative by Swami Dayanand is known as the *Madhyandini Śakha* and the *Rig-Veda* accepted as authoritative is the *Aśvalayini Śakha*. How can these *Śakhas* be accepted as the original *Vedas* ?

173. And further it had been emphasised with great force that Swami Dayanand did not understand from the word *Vedas* anything made of paper and written over with ink etc. but that he meant from it the knowledge of God i.e.

the relationship between the letters, words and meanings and their mutual relationship and usage. If so, where is that knowledge of God now? Is there even one person in the whole world today who is acquainted with the correct reading of the *mantras* of the four *Vedas* and their meanings? If there is no one now who knows the real text i.e. the words of the *Vedas* and their meanings, how can it then be claimed that the knowledge of the *Vedas* has not been lost and that the *Vedas* are eternal?

174. Swami Dayanand established on the authority of grammar etc. that every word i.e. sound, was eternal. It is admitted that every word is eternal, but if every word is eternal, what special importance do the *Vedas* then possess? If the *Vedas* are proved to be eternal because the words are eternal, naturally then all the sounds of the world i.e. all the books e.g. Gulistān, Bostān and even Yathārtha Prakāśa also will be proved to be eternal. If an individual admits that the cows of the world have four legs, it is quite improper for him to boast that his own cow has four legs.

175. Swami Dayanand states that as God revealed the *Vedas*, they should be considered as eternal. But the entire creation also has been created by God. Why is it not eternal and why does dissolution take place at the appointed time? He says that the knowledge of the *Vedas* continues to exist within God at the time of dissolution of the creation and therefore it cannot be said to be non-eternal, but in this way the entire creation also continues to exist in *Brahma*. Why is it then said to be subject to dissolution?

176. Moreover, it should also be borne in mind that the testimony of the beliefs of the followers of the Vedic religion in order to establish the *Vedas* as being eternal is no authority for the public at large. If any Mohammedan, in order to establish the Holy Quran as being eternal, quotes the authority from the books written by the Sahābā[1] of

Prophet Mohammed, would that authority be accepted by the Arya Samajists as correct? The fact of the matter is that it cannot be established that the *Vedas* are eternal. At the most, you can only state your belief in connection with the *Vedas* being eternal and make those people who believe in the *Vedas* and those *Śastras,* the authority of which has been quoted by you, believe that the belief expounded by you is not unfounded because, besides yourself, there are other learned followers of the *Vedas* who hold such belief. But is there any follower of the Vedic religion who does not accept the *Vedas* as eternal and for whose sake it was necessary for Swami Dayanand to carry on this deep and long investigation? Obviously, this discussion was started by Swami Dayanand for the benefit of those who are not among the followers of the *Vedic* religion. In this effort, he has, however absolutely failed.

XXI

IDEAS ABOUT HAVANS AND YAJNAS

177. Discussion regarding the benefits conferred by *Yajnas* begins from page 31 of the Rigvedadi-Bhāshya-Bhūmikā, 1st Urdu Edition. As Swami Dayanand believed in *Yajnas* and similar other activities, but did not believe in the existence of gods, it was a difficult matter for him to explain the philosophy of *Yajnas* and other *ḳarmas.* He however acted, as usual, with fearlessness in this matter as well and with the help of his knowledge of Science, he gave his answer to every objection that was raised, but as he was not acquainted with modern science, his arguments

---

1. 'Sahāba' (صحابه) is the designation given to one who had occasion to live in close association with Prophet Mohammed and who died because of belief in Islam.

reveal great weakness and many faults at different places. For example, he has stated :—

"اگنی ہوتر سے لیکر اشومیدھ تک جس قدر یگیہ ہوتے ہیں
ان میں خوشبودار - شیریں - مقوی اور دافع مرض وغیرہ گنوں
والی باقاعدہ سنسکار کی ہوئی چیزوں کا آگ کے اندر ہوم کیا
جاتا ہے - اس سے ہوا اور بارش کا پانی پاک صاف ہو جاتا ہے
اور تمام دنیا کو سکھ پہونچتا ہے -

"Agnihōtra se lekar Aśvamedha tak jis qadar yajña hōte hain, unmen khushbūdār, shīrīn, muqavvī aur dāf'ah-marz vagairah, gunōn vālī baqāedā sanskār kī huyee chīzōn kā āg ke andar hōm kiyā jātā hai. Us se havā aur bārish kā pānī pāk sāf hō jātā hai aur tamām duniyā kō sukh pahunchtā hai."

Translation—

In the *Yajnas* of various kinds, from *Agnihotra* to *Aśvamedha*, many fragrant, sweet, invigorating and prophylactic things, after they have been thoroughly cleaned, are offered as oblations into fire. This makes the air and the rain water clean and pure and the whole world is benefitted[1].

But can anybody believe that by burning fragrant, sweet and invigorating things in fire, the air and water in the atmosphere become clean and pure? Of course, it so happens that if things like '*loban*'[2], '*guggal*'[2] etc. are burnt, they produce good smell which spreads in the atmosphere, but when sweet things like sugar etc. and invigorating things like almonds, pistachio nuts, etc. are burnt, they simply emit bad smell and the smoke which rises during the process goes up to a certain height in the sky. but to draw the inference that this smoke purifies the water in the atmosphere is nothing but a cheap way to please oneself.

---

1. Rigvedadi Bhashya Bhumika (1st. Urdu Edition), Page 31.
2. Articles burnt as incenses or for producing fragrance in the atmosphere.

178. Further on, while explaining a *Sutra* of the *Purva Mimansa*, he writes :—

’جب دال وغیرہ کو عمدہ بنانے کے لئے چمچہ میں خوشبودار
گھی ڈال - آگ میں تپا - ذرا دھواں سا اٹھنے پر اس سے دال
وغیرہ بگھار کر دیگچی کا منھہ بند کر چمچہ چلاتے ہیں اسوقت
جو مذکورہ بالا دھوئیں کی شکل کی بھاپ اٹھتی ہے وہ خوشبودار
سیال ہوکر تمام دال کے اندر سما جاتی ہے اور اسے خوشبودار بنا
دیتی ہے اور اس سے دال مقوی اور لذیذ بن جاتی ہے - اسی طرح
یگیہ سے جو بھاپ پیدا ہوتی ہے وہ ہوا اور بارش کے پانی کو
سب قسم کی خرابیوں سے پاک اور صاف کرکے تمام دنیا کو سکھ
پہونچاتی ہے -

Jab dāl vagairah kō umdā banāne ke liye chamchā men khushbūdār ghee ḍāl, āg men tapā, zarā dhuān sā uṭhane par us se dāl vagairah baghār kar degachī kā munh band kar chamchā chalāte hain, us vaqta jō mazkūrābālā dhuen ki śakl kī bhāp uṭhatī hai voh khushbūdār sayyāl hōkar tamām dāl ke andar samā jātī hai aur use khushbūdār banā detī hai. Aur us se dāl muqavvī aur lazīz ban jātī hai. Isī tarah yajña (havan) se jō bhāp paidā hōtī hai voh havā aur bārish ke pānī kō sab qism kī kharābiyōn se pāk aur sāf karke tamām duniyā kō sukh pahunchātī hai.”

Translation —

When, in order to make the pulse etc. more tasteful, fragrant ghee is put in a spoon and the spoon is heated in the fire and when smoke begins to rise from that ghee, the ghee is put into the pulse, etc. and the mouth of the vessel is closed, and the spoon is moved in the pulse, then the smoke that rises from the spoon as described above, flowing in the form of fragrance, makes the entire quantity of the pulse fragrant and tasteful. Similarly, the smoke that rises from the yajñas purifies and cleanses the air and the rain water and thus contributes to the happiness of the entire world.

Nobody denies that when the pulse is thus treated with geee, it becomes tasteful according to Indian tastes but it is a false notion that the pulse becomes invigorating because of the fragrance of the heated ghee. Even if it is admitted that the pulse prepared in this manner becomes tasteful and also invigorating, how can it be concluded that the atmosphere is cleaned and purified of all kinds of bad things by means of the *havan* ? At the most, it can be said that according to this principle, the entire atmosphere might become invigorating and tasteful and that too only upto the height to which the sweet scent of the *havan* reaches and certainly not up to the clouds. Moreover, it should also be taken into consideration that the ghee is simply over-heated when the pulse is treated with ghee, but it is burnt when *havan* is performed. Hence if we have to proceed on the principle of the treatment of the pulse with ghee, then for God's sake, only the heating of the ghee to a high temperature should be permitted and burning should be prohibited. Ghee when burnt makes the pulse harmful and dis-tasteful instead of invigorating and tasteful.

179. After this, an authoritative quotation is given from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, in which it is stated that heat produces vapours and that vapours collect higher up in the sky and form clouds and these clouds bring rain. If it is so written in the Śatapatha Brāhmana, it is all quite correct. And this work, i.e. the production of vapours out of water, raising them up high into the atmosphere and collecting them there has been entrusted by nature to the Sun. And what to say of Indians only, even if all the people of the whole world perform *havan* day and night, they will not be able to collect so much water in the sky as may be sufficient to provide for a year's rainfall even in a single continent, Swami Dayanand does admit that the sun discharges this function, but in his opinion, the Sun is not performing its work satisfactorily. He says that the laws

regarding sanitation are of two kinds: those obtaining in nature and others made by man. God has created the Sun and also fragrant things like flowers etc. This is nature's arrangement. The Sun continuously draws forth the moisture from the whole earth, but the particles of matter which the Sun draws out with its rays, "contain both fragrant and foul-smelling particles and as such the water and the air in the atmosphere on account of this combinaton of good and bad qualities are of an average quality, as they are a mixture of fragrant and foul scents. The result is that the plants and cereals which are produced with such rain water and the semen and the human bodies that develop therefrom are all of an average quality and as these things are of an average quality, qualities such as strength, intelligence, bravery, courage, endurance, boldness, etc. also develop only to an average extent because the effect is of the same kind or intensity as the cause". In other words, both kinds of particles, fragrant as well as foul-smelling, are mixed up in the vapours which rise from the earth on account of the heat of the Sun and go up into the sky and the effect of these particles (fragrant and foul) is also of average quality, and the vegetables and cereals produced with rain water of this quality are all of average quality with the result that human beings who use them also acqnire qualities like strength, intelligence, boldness, etc. only to an average extent, which is not a very desirable state of affairs. Swami Dayanand therefore advises that people should perform *yajnas*, as it is man alone who is responsible for all the bad smell on this earth and therefore it is he alone who should make an effort to remove it. And if he does not do so, he makes himself liable to being charged with disobedience to God and thereby liable to punishment. It is not possible at least for the writer of these lines to understand the kind of reasoning employed here. It would therefore be better if first of all, the actual wording of the Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā is perused.

It is stated :—

اسی طرح ایشور نے یہ بھی حکم دیا ھے کہ یگیہ کرنی چاھئے
اس لئے جو شخص اس حکم کی نافرمانی کرتا ھے وہ بھی پاپی ھوکر
دکھ پاتا ھے - یگیہ سب کو سکھ اور فائدہ پہونچانے والی چیز ھے
جب کسی جگہ انسان وغیرہ جانداروں کا ھجوم کثیر ھوتا ھے
وھاں بدبو بھی کثرت سے پیدا ھوتی ھے لیکن اس میں ایشور کا
نظام قدرت باعث نہیں ھے بلکہ انسان وغیرہ جانداروں کے ھجوم
کی کثرت کی وجہ سے بدبو پیدا ھوتی ھے - اور چونکہ ھاتھی
وغیرہ جانوروں کو انسان ھمیشہ اپنے ذاتی آرام کے لئے جمع کرتا
ھے اس لئے ان سے جو سخت بدبو پیدا ھوتی ھے - اس کا باعث
صرف انسان کا ذاتی آرام ھے - اس طرح وہ تمام بدبو جو ھوا اور
بارش کے پانی کو خراب کرتی ھے صرف انسان کی بدولت پیدا ھوتی
ھے - اس لئے اس کو دفع کرنا بھی اسی کا فرض ھے -

Isī tarah Īśvar ne yeh bhī hukum diyā hai ki yajña karnī chāhiye. Is liye jō shakhs is hukum kī nāfarmānī kartā hai voh bhī pāpī hōkar dukh pātā hai. Yajña sabkō sukh aur fāyedā pahunchāne vālī chīz hai. Jab kisī jagah insān vagairah jāndārōn kā hujūm kasīr hōtā hai, vahān badbū bhī kasrat se paidā hōtī hai. Magar ismen Īśvar kā nizāme qudrat bāyas nahīn hai balke insān vagairah jāndāron ke hujūm kī kasrat kī vajah se badbū paidā hōtī hai. Aur chūnke hāthī vagairah jānvarōn kō insān hameshā apne zāti ārām ke liye jamā kartā hai, is liye unse jō sakht badbū paidā hōtī hai, uskā bāyas sirf insān kā zātī ārām hai. Is tarah voh tamām badbū jō havā aur bārish ke pānī kō kharāb kartī hai, sirf insān kī badaulat paidā hōtī hai. Is liye uskō dafā karnā bhī usī kā farz hai."

Translation—

Similarly, God has also ordered that man should perform *yajnas*. Therefore, the person who disobeys this order becomes a sinner and consequently undergoes punishment. *Yajnas* lead to happiness of all the people and confer great benefit. When there is a vast congregation of men and animals at any place, bad smell is produced in abundance, but arrangements made in nature by God are not responsible for this.

On the other hand, this bad smell is produced as a result of the congregation of human beings and other animals in large numbers. And as man keeps animals like elephants etc. for his own comfort, the very bad smell spread by these animals is therefore caused simply by man's desire for his personal comforts. Thus all that bad smell which makes the air and rain water impure is simply due to man. It is therefore, his duty to remove that bad smell."

Obviously, the argument is extremely complicated. It would be better if the subject matter is divided into separate sentences, so that the full force of the argument may be appreciated and the true meaning of the whole argument understood.

180. The following things have been stated in this argument:—

(1) The vapours, arising because of the rays of the Sun, contain within them fragrant as well as foul-smelling particles.

(2) As a result of the mingling of both the sweet and bad odours, the effect which the mixed particles provide is of an average quality.

(3) The rain falling from clouds produced by these vapours is also of an average quality as it is also affected by these particles.

(4) The plants and cereals etc. which grow on land watered with this rain water are also of an average quality on account of the effect of these particles.

(5) The semen and the bodies of men which develop as a result of the use of these plants and cereals are also of an average quality.

(6) And under the influence of these things, man's strength, intelligence, bravery, etc. are of an average quality.

(7) Wherever a large number of people and animals collect, bad smell is produced in abundance, but arrangements of nature are not responsible for this bad smell.

(8) Man always collects elephants and other animals for his own comfort, and therefore man himself is responsible for the bad smell produced by these animals.

(9) Thus all the bad smell which makes the air and rain water impure is due to man and therefore it is man's duty to remove it.

(10) For removing it, God has ordered that *yajnas* should be performed. Hence, the person who does not perform *yajnas*, commits a sin and therefore suffers misery.

Comment—The words of item 9 above deserve special attention, because they are the substance of the entire argument.

181. Readers must have observed that here too, average of sweet and bad odours of particles has been worked out as it had been done in para 51 in the case of the milk of the cows and the method of calculation of this average also accords with the principles of Mathematics just as the average was worked out in the case of the milk of the cows, but the difficulty is that experts in matters of health and sanitation declare that the rays of the sun act as disinfectants and purify the earth and the atmosphere of germs harmful to man, because the ingredients of rotten and foul substances are converted by the heat of the rays of the sun into the original five elements or are divided into much smaller particles and spread into the atmosphere and as wind currents blow in the atmosphere at great velocity, particularly above a certain height, these smaller particles are dispersed over a large area or are carried to great distances and either on account of their dispersal or on account of their contact with other particles present in the atmosphere they become quite harmless. But according to the belief of Swami

Dayanand all those particles continue to exist exactly in the same condition in which they are lifted up from the earth by the rays of the sun and when it rains, these particles come down to the earth with the rain water bringing their former characteristics in tact and infuse their previous qualities in the plants and in the cereals etc. Are experts of Physical Geography and Chemists of the world mere blockheads that they declare in vain that rain water, with the exception of the first shower, is generally pure and clean ? They say that as the first shower brings down with it the dust and dirt and also the germs which are mixed up with the dust which rises from the earth and are found in the atmosphere adjoining the surface of the earth, this water is generally harmful to men. But the ideas that foul particles rise up into the sky with the vapours of water produced by the heat of the sun, that their bad qualities combine with the water which is produced from those vapours and that plants etc. raised on land with that water when it falls as rain, because of its having imbibed all those bad qualities, are of an average quality, are such as would make everybody feel astonished, for the whole world knows and believes that the food for plants is the manure which includes much more foul material than can ever be found in the atmosphere and in the water coming down as rain and all the plants nourished on that manure grow and develop. Now if, according to the teachings of Swami Dayanand, the people of the world make the atmosphere pure and clean by performing *Havans* and *Yajnas* and in future water coming down as rain may be quite clean and pure as they desire, even then there would be no appreciable difference in the quality of plants and cereals because the farmers would as hitherto be heaping all refuse matter and filth in the fields and would be putting manure in quantities prescribed per acre as they have been doing so far. If Swami Dayanand had at the same time taught that in the fields where cereal crops are grown and in the plants no foul substances should

be thrown but on the other hand fragrant, sweet and invigorating substances should be put and, instead of the dirty water of ponds, tanks and canals, people should use rose water from Jaunpur and *kewra* water from Ghazipur to irrigate the plants, the attempt to make the atmosphere clean and pure by acting on the advice of Swami Dayanand to perform *havans* etc., could then be said to be an activity beneficial to human beings. Are Indians inferior to the people of the West in physical strength, intelligence, valour, courage, endurance and boldness simply because every man and woman of the West regularly performs *havans* and *yajnas* and Indians are indifferent in the matter? Does rain-fall at Cheerapoonji go upto 400 inches because the people of that place remain engaged day and night in performing *havans* and *yajnas* etc. and is the rain-fall in Rajputana scarce because the people of Rajputana do not perform *havans* and *yajnas*?

182. There is no doubt that filth and urine etc. are produced in large quantities where living beings collect, in large numbers but when the bodies of all living beings have been created by God Himself and it is in pursuance of the laws of nature that filth and urine etc. are excreted out of the bodies of living beings, why should then human beings be held responsible for the bad smell produced by these things and how does Swami Dayanand state that the laws of nature made by God are not responsible for these things? Have living beings themselves arranged that urine and filth etc. should be ejected out of their bodies? Did God make arrangements that fragrant substances should pass out of the bodies of living beings, but human beings adopted crooked ways and started passing out filth and urine? No, all these arguments prove only that Swami Dayanand was unacquainted with the laws of nature. The dirt which passes out of the human body through exhalation and in the form of urine and filth etc. is like nectar for plant life. One may, on seeing these things

which serve as food for them, express one's resentment but the plants etc. cry out loudly in one voice :—

اے شیخ ترا نان جوین خوش نہ نماید ۔
معشوق من است آں کہ بہ نزدیک تو زشت است ۔

Ai Sheikh turā nāne javīn khush na numāyad,
Mashūq-e-man ast ān ke banazdīk tō zisht ast.

Translation—

O Sheikh, you do not like the bread of barley, but what you condemn as ugly appears to me to be very lovely and charming.

183. The idea of Swami Dayanand was that every kind of bad smell was injurious to man and every good smell was useful but the whole world knows that just as all bitter things are not poisonous, similarly all kinds of bad smells are not injurious and fatal for man. For example, take the case of the odour of Phenyl. It is considered to be a bad odour but it is not injurious for man in any way. Or take the case of lemon. It is thought that it gives out a good smell but if one takes in its smell for long, one catches cold. The fact of the matter is that there is neither any good nor any bad smell in the world. The odour which man likes is called by him 'good' and the odour which he does not like is called 'bad'. And moreover, every odour is not liked or disliked uniformly by all the people of the world. For example, the odour of onions and garlic is liked by some people and to some others, it is unbearable. Similarly, the odour of petrol and kerosene oil is disliked by majority of Indians but not so by Englishmen. It is also observed that smell is not felt by every man because the smelling power of all men is not similar. For example, many people do not at all feel any kind of smell in the kerosine oil. In short, bad odour and good odour are relative terms and it is not necessary that every kind of bad odour be injurious and fatal to man. Of course, it is a fact that if there is bad odour anywhere,

there is generally some thing or some substance in a rotting condition there, i. e., bad odour is generally an indication of the rotten condition of some thing or substance. Whenever anything or any substance begins to rot at any place, a large number of germs are produced in it and they are carried away by the breeze and enter the body of man through the nose or the mouth and produce diseases. But it should be borne in mind that these germs are not the bad odour of the thing that rots. The particles of bad odour which float in the air are lifeless, whereas the germs are living organisms. It is for this reason that these days such medicines as are capable of destroying germs are sprinkled over the place where there is bad odour. For example, the carbolic acid present in Phenyl has the virtue of destroying the germs in drains etc. If according to the principle enunciated by Swami Dayanand, some fool sprinkles rose water or scents in dirty drains and hopes that there is no danger of any disease spreading or fills the atmosphere of the house of a patient of cholera or plague with the scents of flowers or that produced by *havan* and feels that the house has been freed from the germs of the disease, he will have to suffer for the foolishness of his action in a short time. If good odour is spread at any place, the result is that bad odour is not felt for some time, exactly as a carpet spread in a room hides from view the dirt and dust lying on the floor of the room. This does not, however, mean that disease-producing germs of that room are all destroyed in the process. These germs can of course be destroyed by the use of poisonous gases, but no such thing as may produce any poisonous gas forms part of the *samagri*[1] which is burnt at the time of *havan*. Thus the idea that the burning of *havan samagri* or sweet and invigorating substances would help in the destruction of harmful germs or the spreading of good smell in the atmosphere or would help in bringing down rain is merely a foolish idea.

1. Substances put into fire while performing havans and yajñas are known collectively as sāmagrī.

184. The idea of Swami Dayanand that nature's law of sanitation is limited to what the Sun does or flowers and other fragrant things do is also not correct. Probably he did not know that, besides these, earth, water and the air as well as innumerable creatures and germs living therein are engaged day and night in the work of maintaining cleanliness. What are dogs, crows, vultures, rats, cats, insects, worms, white ants and flies if not scavengers working on behalf of nature? In addition to these, there are innumerable living organisms in the earth and water which are not visible to the naked eyes but which are engaged day and night in bringing about chemical changes in the ingredients of dirty and filthy things. If anything is buried in the earth, it gradually changes into earth and in the same way, if anything is put in water or fire, sooner or later, it also assumes their shape. But the functions which air has to perform are superior to everything else. When the heat of the rays of the Sun separates the particles of dirty or filthy things lying on the surface of the earth, then, on the one hand, water present in such things evaporates and rises up in the sky in the form of vapours and on the other hand, the solid portion is reduced to particles which begin to float in the air. If the vapours which go up into the sky come into contact with cold wind, they at once turn into clouds and float in the sky in the form of clouds, otherwise they float about from place to place in the atmosphere in the form of water-vapours. When the clouds which form out of these vapours or out of the vapours brought by sea-winds collect in dense formations and begin to rain, the rain water brings down with it from the atmosphere all those particles which are present at that time in the atmosphere. These dry particles while floating in the atmosphere are divided by the rays of the Sun into very minute particles and they are often converted to their elemental condition. Even when they continue to exist in their orignal condition, their size is reduced to such a great extent that even when they strike

against the nose of a person, he does not feel any bad odour and when they come down to the earth with rain water, they do no harm to any living being.

185. As regards the poisonous gases, instead of giving our own opinion, an extract from a text-book of Physics is given below. The name of the book is 'A Text Book of Physics' and its authors are Professor Duncan and Professor Starling. It is stated at page 304 of the book as follows :—

> "The property of diffusion in gases is of great importance in the prevention of accumulations of noxious gases in towns and confined spaces. Carbon dioxide does not support life, and a comparatively small percentage of this gas in the atmosphere is dangerous. The exhalations of animals consist largely of carbon dioxide, which is also given off in large volumes in many industrial processes. The gas diffuses rapidly into the atmosphere, the process being assisted by the stirring produced by air currents and thus a mixture is attained which is not dangerous. Some idea of the rate of diffusion of carbon dioxide and air may be obtained from the observed fact that in a vertical tube about 60 cm. long, and having the lower tenth of its length charged with carbon dioxide, the upper nine-tenths containing air, diffusion is completed in about two hours. The time taken is proportional to the square of the length of the tube."

186. After all this discussion, the only thing that remains to be investigated is what object Swami Dayanand had in mind when he used the expression 'mutwassat gun vāle' (having average qualities). Is it that the mingling together of good and bad odours brings into existence some sort of an average condition which can neither be called good smell nor bad odour ? And even if it really happens so, what effect, if at all, can it produce on plants and on cereals ? And if it does produce some effect on plants etc.,

what is signified by the statement that it prevents strength, intelligence, valour and other qualities of man from developing and going beyond what are average qualities? So far everyone of us had heard only that '*Prakriti*' had three *gunas*—*sat*, *raj* and *tam*—due to the influence of which the articles of food were considered to be of three kinds, viz, '*satviki*, *rajasi*, and *tamasi*' and that by the use of these, effect of different kinds was produced upon the temperaments of living beings. But it has now for the first time come to notice from the Bhāshya Bhūmikā of Swami Dayanand that the particles of good and bad odours which enter plants and cereals through rain water also produce considerable effect on the qualities of head and heart of a man! No, no. All these are far-fetched ideas. *Havans* and *yajnas* were performed in ancient times in order to get admission into *Svarga* and to attain the pleasure of gods and not to destroy the germs of houses. Gods pleased with the worship done to them, fulfilled both the worldly as well as the spiritual desires of their worshippers. Accordingly, there are hundreds of *richas* or *mantras* in the *Vedas* pertaining to these desires which were recited at the time of *yajnas*, and when these *richas* were recited, gods pertaining to those *richas* manifested themselves and helped their worshippers. In this connection, the Bhagvad Gita and then the Muṇḍaka Upanishad may be referred to and it may be seen what belief the *Rishis* of the past had held regarding *havans* and *yajnas*. Lord Krishna has written :—

> Those who know the three *Vedas*, who drink the *Soma* juice and those who are free from sins etc., worship me through *yajnas* and pray to me for being taken to the *Svarga Loka* and on attaining the *Loka* of Indra, the Chief of gods, they enjoy the pleasures of gods in the *Svarga*. (IX-20)
>
> O Arjun, now listen about the different kinds of *yajnas*. Some *Yogis* who believe in *Karma Yoga*,

perform the *yajnas* to worship gods and there are others who perform *yajnas* by making oblations in *Brahma Agni*. (IV—25)

O Arjun, many kinds of *yajnas* are described in this way in the *Vedas*; but you should bear in mind that all these *yajnas* are the result of *karmas*. When you understand this, you will be able to attain salvation. (IV—32)

O Arjun, the *yajna* of knowledge is superior to those *yajnas* in which the material things of the world are offered as oblations, because all actions end in knowledge, i.e. the end of all actions is knowledge. (IV—33)

But this knowledge can be attained by you from *Tattvadarshi Purushas*, i.e. from those who know the truth and in order to attain it, you will have to fall at their feet, make enquiries from them and engage yourself in their service. (IV—34)

In the same manner, it is stated in the Mundaka Upanishad :—

यह सत्य है कि ऋषियों ने वेद के मंत्रों में जो कर्म देखे हैं वे त्रेता (अर्थात् ऋक्, यजुर्, साम तीन प्रकार के मंत्रों) में अनेक प्रकार से फैले हुए हैं। उनको तुम नियम से आचरण करो, हे सचाई से प्यार करने वालो, यह तुम्हारा रास्ता है जो पुण्य के लोक में ले जाता है। (१)

जब अग्नि के प्रदीप्त (रोशन) होने पर लाट खेलती है तब आज्यभाग की दो आहुतियों के बिना आहुतिएँ देनी चाहियें। (२)

जिसका अग्निहोत्र बिना दर्श, पौर्णमास, चातुर्मास्य, और आग्रायण के है, अतिथियों से वर्जित है, बराबर जारी नहीं रहता है, बिना वैश्वदेव के है, विधि से नहीं किया जाता है, वह उसके सातों लोक नष्ट कर देता है। (३)

काले रँग की, भयंकर, मन की नाई वेगवाली, बड़ी लाल, धुएँ के रँग वाली, चिनगारियों वाली यह लाटें चारों ओर खेलती हुई (अग्नि की) सात जिह्वा कहलाती हैं। (४)

जब ये चमक रही हों तो ठीक समय पर इनमें आहुतिएँ देता

हुआ जो यजमान कर्म को पूरा करता है उसको ये सूर्य की किरणें बन कर वहाँ ले जाती हैं जहाँ देवताओं का एक मालिक रहता है। (५)

'आओ, आओ' यह उसे कहती हुई, वे चमकती हुई आहुतिएँ यजमान को सूर्य की रश्मियों के द्वारा उठा ले जाती हैं, प्यारी वाणी बोलती हुई और उसकी स्तुति करती हुई (कहती हुई) 'यह तुम्हारा पवित्र ब्रह्मलोक है जिसको तुमने अपने पवित्र कर्मों से लाभ किया है (६)

(पंडित राजाराम कृत मुण्डक उपनिषद् भाष्य, पृष्ठ ८ से १०)

"Yeh satya hai ke Rishiōn ne (Veda ke) mantrōn men jō karm dekhe hain, ve tretā (arthāt Ṛik, Yajur, Sāma tīn prakār ke mantrōn) men anek prakār se phaile huye hain. Unkō tum niyam se ācharaṇ karō, he sachāyee se pyār karne vālō, yeh tumhārā rāstā hai, jō puṇya ke lōkā men le jātā hai. (1)

Jab Agni ke pradīpta (rōshan) hōne par lāṭ khelatī hai tab ājya-bhāg kī dō ānutiyōn ke binā āhutiyen denī chāhiyen. (2)

Jiskā Agnihōtra binā darś, paurṇamās, chāturmāsya aur āgrāyaṇ ke hai, atithiyōn se varjit hai, barābar jārī nahīn rahtā hai, binā vaiśvadeva ke hai, va vidhi se nahīn kiyā jātā hai, voh uske sātōn lōka nashṭ kar detā hai. (3)

Kāle rang kī, bhayankar, man kī nāyīn veg vālī, baṛī lāl, dhuyen ke rang vālī, chingāriyōn vālī, yeh (lāṭen) chārōn ōr khelati huyīn (Agni kī) sāt jihvā kahlātī hain. (4)

Jab ye chamak rahī hōn, tō ṭhīk samaye par inmen āhutiyen detā huā jō yajmān karm kō pūrā kartā hai, uskō ye sūrya kī kiraṇen ban kar vahān le jātī hain jahān devtāōn kā ek mālik rahtā hai. (5)

'Āao, āao', yeh use kahtī huyīn, va chamakatī huyīn āhutiyān yajmān kō sūrya kī raśmiyōn ke dvārā uṭhā le jātī hain, pyārī vāṇī bōltī huyīn aur uskī stuti kartī huyīn (kahtī huyīn) 'Yeh tumhārā pavitra Brahma Loka hai jiskō tum ne apne pavitra karmōn se lābh kiyā hai'.." (6)

(Pandit Rāja Ram kṛit Munḍaka Upanishad kā Bhāshya Munḍaka 1, Khand 2, Pages 8-10).

Translation —

It is correct that the *karmas* that the *Rishis* have seen mentioned in the *mantras* of the *Vedas* are spread all over in the three *Vedas*—*Rig-Veda*, *Yajur-*

Veda and *Sam-Veda.* You should follow them regularly, O You Lover of Truth ! This is the way which will lead you to the *Punya Loka.* (1).

When fire is kindled[1] and flames rise up, oblations should be offered with the exception of the two oblations of *Ajyabhaga*[2]. (2)

That *Agnihotra,* which does not include *Darśa*[3], *Paurnamasa*[4], *Chaturmasya*[5] & *Agrayana*[6] and in which guests are prohibited, which is not continued throughout and which also excludes *Vaiśvadeva* or is not performed systematically, destroys all the seven *Lokas* of the performer, i.e. makes him unfit to get happiness in any other *Lokas.* (3)

These flames of Fire, black in colour, frightful, fickle like man's mind, scarlet red or smoke-coloured, full of sparks, playing on all sides are known as the seven tongues of Fire. (4)

When the performer of the *Yajna* puts in oblations at the proper timings, i. e. when the tongues of fire are shining brightly and completes the job, these tongues of fire become the rays of the sun and carry away the performer of the *Yajna* to the place where the Lord of the gods abides. (5)

These brightly shining oblations cry to the sacrificer, 'Come, come' and speaking sweetly to him and praising him carry him, by means of the rays of the sun, to *Brahma Loka* and there tell him that

---

1. As the Agnihōtra is the basis of all other sacrifices, it has been described first of all. 2. Liquid ghee is known as 'ājya'. In the two sacrifices, 'Darśa' and Paurṇmāsa, the first two oblations offered are of such ghee. This is known as 'ājyabhāga'. 3. Sacrifice performed on New Moon day. 4. Sacrifice performed on Pūrṇamāsī i.e. Full Moon day. 5. Four sacrifices performed in four months, one in each. 6. Sacrifice in the harvest season which occurs about November and April every year.

he had reached the *Brahma Loka*, which he had attained by his good deeds. (6)

(Muṇḍaka Upanishad, Muṇḍaka 1, Khanḍ 2, pages 8 to 10, translated by Pt. Raja Ram).

This is the real object and purpose of the *Havans* and *Yajnas*. It is in vain to expect that they would serve the purpose which phenyl, carbolic acid and other acids serve. If the object was to teach people to perform *Yajnas*, it would have been better if he had advised performance of *Jnana Yajna* which is superior to every other *Yajna* and by the performance of which man attains the highest state.

187. It appears that some one, on hearing all these views of Swami Dayanand regarding *havans* etc., enquired from him whether it would not be better if instead of burning these invigorating articles in the fire, they are given to somebody to eat so that they may be put to better use. Swami Dayanand has mentioned this question in the Rigvedadi Bhashya Bhumika and has also given his reply which is worth perusal. It is stated :—

سوال—کستوری وغیرہ خوشبودار چیزوں کو آگ میں ڈال کر ناش کرنے سے یگیہ کس طرح فائدہمند یا فیض رساں ہو سکتی ہے - اس سے تو یہ عمدہ نعامتیں کسی کو کھلادی جاویں یا دان کردي جاویں تو ہوم سے بھی زیادہ پھل ہو - پھر یگیہ کیوں کریں ؟

جواب—کوئی چیز بھی بالکل معدوم نہیں ہوتی - وناش سے یہی مراد ہے کہ کوئی شے محسوس ہوکر پھر محسوس نہ رہے -

"Savāl—Kastūrī vagairah khushbūdār chīzōn kō āg men ḍālkar nāś karne se yajña kis tarah fāyedāmand yā faizrasān hō saktī hai? Is se tō yeh umdā niyāmten kisī kō khilā dī jāven yā dān kar dī jāven tō hōm se bhī zyādā phal hō. Phir yajña kyōn karen?

'Javāb—Kōyee chīz bhī bilkul mādūm nahīn hōtī. Vināś

se yehī murād hai ke kōyee shai mahsūs hōkar phir mahsūs na rahe."

Translation —

Question—How can *yajnas* be useful when fragrant things like '*kasturi*' and others are thrown into the fire and are destroyed? It would be more useful if these things are given to some person to eat or they are given as gifts. Why should then *yajnas* be performed?

Answer—Nothing in this world is completely destroyed. The idea in the word 'destruction' is that anything which was formerly visible does not remain visible subsequently.

This is indeed fine! If nothing is destroyed, then evidently, injurious germs would also not be destroyed and the particles of bad odour also would always continue to exist and their effect would also continue. What is the advantage from *havan* then? And if by the performance of *havan*, the *samagri* is not burnt and destroyed, why is new *samagri* collected for performing the *havan* a second time after performing it once? The *samagri* purchased once and used once should thus be sufficient for ever.

Appendix

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

When the difficulties of Satsangis regarding the statements recorded in the books of Swami Dayanand, viz, Satyārtha Prakāsa, Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, etc. had been written, it occurred to me that it was desirable, before sending the draft of the book to the press, to assure myself by discussing the subject with some capable Pandit of Arya Samāj that there had been no mistake in understanding the sense of the books of Swami Dayanand. Accordingly, to achieve this object, a letter was addressed to the respected President of the Arya Samaj, Agra, on 25th November, 1934, and a very kind reply was received from him. And then after a little more correspondence, Pandit Shiva Sharma Sahab, Mahopadesak, Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, U.P., was appointed by the Arya Samaj to help in this noble work. Hence Pandit Shiva Sharma came to Dayalbagh with this object on 3rd, 4th and 5th January, 1935 and the President of the Arya Samaj, Agra, also accompanied him on one day. On the first day for about an hour and on the two succeeding days for about 2½ hours each day, questions were asked and answers given and these were simultaneuosly written down. And at the end, Pandit Shiva Sharma and the representatives of Dayalbagh signed the papers, containing the questions and answers, in confirmation. All the questions and answers are given below as in original so that the readers of Yathārtha Prakāsa may be assured that no effort has been spared from our side to understand the correct sense of the books of Swami Dayanand. To indicate the connection of these questions with the subjects discussed in the Yathārtha Prakāsa, serial numbers of the relative paragraphs of the Yathārtha Prakāsa have been given at different places along with brief notes in smaller type.

Thursday, January 3, 1935

Time—4 p. m.

1, *Question*—Can there be '*pratyaksha jnana*' of God and can '*pratyaksha pramana*' be given to establish the existence of God ?

Answer—God cannot be perceived by the senses, i.e. no '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct knowledge of God can be obtained through the senses. And when there is no '*pratyaksha jnana*', '*pratyaksha pramana*' also is not possible. '*Pratyaksha jnana*' of God can be obtained only by entering into the state of *Samadhi*. This is the opinion of the *Upanishads* and this is also an important principle of the Arya Samaj.

2. *Qusetion*—Then can the existence of God be established by means of '*anumana pramana*' ?

Answer—When there can be no '*pratyaksha pramana*', there can be no '*anumana pramana*' either, because '*anumana pramana* is dependent on '*pratyaksha pramana*'. Knowledge of God can be had on the basis of the statement of some '*Apta Purusha*'. The statement on page 204 of the 4th Urdu edition of the Satyārtha Prakāsa', سب پرتیکش وغیرہ ثبوتوں سے ('sab *pratyaksha* vagairah sabūton se'), i.e. "with the help of all *pratyaksha* and other *pramanas*", means that direct knowledge of the attributes is obtained by means of senses and then the existence of the possessor of those attributes is established by means of '*anumana pramana*'. The existence of God is thus said to be established in this manner by *pratyaksha* and other *pramanas*. The knowledge of the possessor of attributes obtained through the knowledge of the attributes is said to be '*anumana pramana*'. It will not be called '*pratyaksha pramana*.'

3. *Question*—How can there be even '*anumana*', because

without '*pratyaksha*' i.e. direct perception, there can be no '*anumana*' either?

Answer—Just as on having '*pratyaksha jnana*' or direct perception of workmanship, form or attributes, one forms an idea of the artist.

4. *Question*—But can '*pratyaksha pramana*' be said to apply to the case of God?

Answer—As attributes are the essence of the possessor of the attributes, the '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge of the attributes is said to give the '*pratyaksha*' or direct knowledge of the possessor of the attributes.

Note—These questions relate to paragraphs 117 to 139 wherein the attempt of Swami Dayanand to establish the existence of God by means of 'pratyaksha' and other 'pramāṇas' has been discussed. While replying to Questions 1 & 2, Pandit Shiva Sharma clearly admitted that neither 'pratyaksha' nor 'anumana pramāṇa' can be given regarding the existence of God, but when reference of Satyārtha Prakāśa (Authorised Urdu Edition) was mentioned, Pt. Shiva Sharma took up the position taken by Swami Dayanand.

REGARDING REVOLUTIONS OF THE SUN

5. *Question*—Does the sun really move from one zodiacal sign to the other or does it only appear, to those who live on the earth, as if it was moving?

Answer—The sun moves round its own axis, the zodiacal constellations revolve round the sun and the sun does not revolve round any planet.

6. *Question*—But what is the meaning of the words:—

"यदि सूरज न घूमता होता तो एक राशि स्थान से दूसरे राशि स्थान को प्राप्त न होता"

Yadi sūraj na ghūmatā hotā to ek Rāśi sthān se dūsre Rāśi sthān ko prāpta na hotā,

Translation —

"If the Sun had not been revolving, it could not have gone from one zodiacal house to another ?"

The movement of the Sun from one Zodiacal house to another has evidently been admitted in these words as an argument in support of the revolution of the sun.

Answer—The idea is that the Sun forms connection with a particular Zodiacal house. It does not mean that the Sun by itself moves from one Zodiacal house to another.

7. *Question*—It is stated—

"जो लोग कहते हैं कि सूरज घूमता और पृथ्वी नहीं घूमती वे सब अज्ञ हैं क्योंकि जो ऐसा होता तो कई सहस्र वर्ष के दिन और रात होते।"

Jo log kahte hain ke sūraj ghūmtā aur pṛithvī nahīn ghūmtī, voh sab ajña hain kyonke jo aisā hotā to kayee sahasra varṡ ke din aur rāt hote.

Translation —

"People who say that the Sun revolves and the earth does not are all ignorant; because if it had been so, days and nights would have been as long as a thousand years." What is the meaning of this ?

Answer —The meaning is that if the Sun had been revolving round the earth, it would have taken a very long time and the days and nights would have been thousands of years long. Now the earth revolves round the Sun and therefore days and nights are only of 24 hours' duration.

Note — These questions relate to paragraphs 49 and 50. In the answers given, Pt. Shiva Sharma confirms that the meaning of what has been written by Swami Dayanand is that days and nights are only of 24 hours' duration because the earth revolves round the Sun, though the whole world knows that the earth takes 365 days 5 hours and some minutes in revolving round the Sun. In his answer to Question No. 5, Pt. Sharma has added of his own accord that all the Zodiacal constellations revolve round the Sun, though even this is against facts.

Friday, 4th January, 1935

Time—2.15 p.m.

8. *Question*—It is stated that God did not reveal the *Vedas* in the language of any country because in that case, He would have been considered partial. At the same time, it is stated that the *Vedas* were revealed in the beginning of the creation. Were many countries populated in the beginning of the creation and were there many languages prevalent then ?

Answer—This question was put to Swami Dayanand at a time when many languages were prevalent in the world.

9. *Question*—God revealed the *mantras* of the *Vedas* in Sanskrit which was not the language of any country, but which language did he adopt to reveal the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* ?

Answer—The meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* also were revealed in Sanskrit and not in the language of any country.

10. *Question*—In that case, how did the *Rishis*, to whom the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were revealed in a language with which they were not acquainted, understand the sense of the *mantras* ?

Answer—The residents of a country, where only one language is spoken, understand the meanings of that language through that very language. The meanings are not explained to them by means of translation into some other language.

11. *Question*—But when Sanskrit was not the language of any particular country, how did the *Rishis* understand the meanings of the *mantras* ? And if the meanings were explained to them in the language of their country, it could

not have been Sanskrit because it is stated that Sanskrit was not the language of any country.

Answer—God revealed the *mantras* as well as their meanings at the same time and both were revealed in the Sanskrit language.

Note:—These questions relate to paragraphs 114 and 115. Pt. Shiva Sharma tried to solve his difficulty by saying that God revealed the mantras of the Vedas as well as their meanings in Sanskrit, though, on his admission that Sanskrit was not prevalent in any country, meanings of the mantras revealed by God in Sanskrit could not have been understood by those Rishis to whom the meanings were revealed, for they were as incapable of understanding the sense of the meanings as of understandig the sense of the mantras..

12. *Question*—Whether according to the belief of Swami Dayanand, the expression '*Vedas*' refers to the four books—*Rig*, *Yajur*, *Sama* and *Atharva* only, or there is some other knowledge also outside these books which can be called as forming part of the *Vedas* ?

Answer—These four books only are known as the '*Vedas*'.

13. *Question*—Is it in accordance with the principles of Arya Samaj to have absolute reliance on these four *Vedas* ?

Answer—Yes, Sir.

Note:—These answers of Pt. Shiva Sharma are quite in accordance with the teachings of the Satyārtha Prakāśa and the Ṛigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, but they are quite opposed to what has been written in the unpublished letter of Swami Dayanand quoted in paragraph 103 (A).

14. *Question*—You have just stated that knowledge does not in itself exist in any particular language, but that it is expressed or revealed through a particular language. Then did God, in the beginning of the creation reveal the *mantras* of the *Vedas* or the knowledge contained in the *mantras* of the *Vedas* ?

Answer—The language through which the *Rishis* revealed their knowledge was also itself a gift from God.

Note—This question was put to Pandit Shiva Sharma when he had admitted that divine knowledge is not revealed to man in any language but that when man has received that knowledge, he expresses it through some language. Then in these circumstances, the language of the mantras of the Vedas cannot be a language given by God; it is thus proved that it is the language of the Rishis.

15. *Question*—When was that language given to human beings? Which was revealed first of all—knowledge of the *Vedas* or the *mantras* of the *Vedas* or their language?

Answer—The language and the knowledge were given at the same time. The language through which the *Rishis* manifested the knowledge is known as the *mantras* of the *Vedas*.

Note—This question was asked in continuation of Question 14 above. If the answers given to the two questions are read together, it would appear how difficult it is to prove that every word of the mantras of the Vedas was revealed by God.

16. *Question*—Kindly give proof in support of the conclusion drawn on page 31 of the Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā from the example of the treatment of pulse soup with heated ghee regarding the cleansing and the purification of the air and the rain water of all their impurities by means of *havan*.

Answer—The example given here does not refer only to ghee, but also to asafoetida, cumin seed, etc. also put into pulses. These help in the removal of diseases like obesity, etc.

17. *Question*—But while treating the pulse, the ghee is only heated to a high temperature and as such even in *havan*, ghee should be so heated and not burnt. If ghee is burnt and put in pulse, the pulse would give a bad taste.

Answer—Just as ghee on reaching a man's stomach

makes his body strong, in the same manner, the *Yajna Kund* (sacrificial pit)[1] is the stomach of the atmosphere and fire burning in the *Yajna Kund* is like the heat of the stomach. Thus the entire atmosphere becomes invigorating.

Note—These questions relate to para 178, but the question regarding the purification of the atmosphere as well as the rain water, inspite of the fact that asafoetida, cumin seed, etc. have been shown to be included in ghee, remains ünanswered and the statement that the ghee burnt in the sacrificial pit renders the whole atmosphere invigorating has not been understood as yet.

18. *Question*—People have been prohibited on page 212, Samullas 7 of Satyārtha Prakāsa, 4th Urdu Edition, from offering such prayers as "Make me the greatest of all men; may I be praised and all persons be subordinate to me", etc. But in the Rigvedādi Bhāshya Bhūmikā, lst. Urdu Edition, it is stated on page 144 with reference to the authority of the Aitereya Brahmana :—

"Man should always work hard and make efforts and should have the desire that he may attain the position of the President, that the whole world may be subordinate to him and that he may become famous and occupy an important position among all kings".

Please reconcile these two statements.

Answer—Where Swami Dayanand has only prohibited people from offering prayers, the idea is that if man would offer prayers without making any effort i.e. without performing any action, his prayer would be of no avail. At another place, it has been stated that man should make effort and while doing so, should try to attain the position of President etc.

19. *Question*—But it has not been so stated in the Satyārtha Prakāsa. On the other hand, it is stated that such prayers should not be offered under any circumstances

1. In Yajñas and havans, a square pit of the prescribed size is made and fire is kindled in this pit and oblations offered therein.

and that God does not accept such prayers, because if each one of the two enemies prayed to God for the death of the other, would God arrange for the death of both of them, etc. ? And such prayers have been declared to be foolish prayers. In other words, such prayers have been declared in the Satyārtha Prakāsa to be harmful.

Answer—Swami Dayanand has prohibited mere offering of prayers unaccompanied by effort. If prayers are offered after making effort, they will be accepted. If, without making an effort, two enemies pray for the death of the other, their prayers would be in vain.

Note— These questions relate to paragaph 111. Obviously these replies are opposed to what Swami Dayanand said.

20. *Question*—In connection with the inference drawn regarding the existence of God, from the condition of a man's heart, it is stated that the moment man begins to perform bad actions, feelings of fear, hesitation and shame which are engendered within man and the feelings of fearlessness, non-hesitation, cheerfulness and courage while performing good actions are all produced by God and not by the spirit of man. Is the Voice of Conscience referred to here or something else is referred to ?

Answer—The Voicc of Conscience is referred to here.

21. *Question*—But the Voice of Conscience changes when the mentality of a person changes. (For example, a Mohammedan considers that killing of animals is his religious duty but when he becomes a follower of the Arya Samaj, he begins to call it an irreligious act). Does this mean that the change which takes place in the Voice of Conscience as a result of change in the mentality of a person is really a change in the Voice of God ?

Answer—The inspiration of God is similar for all. If a man moved by his faith kills any animal, i.e. sacrifices it, according to the principles of the Vedic Religion he also

acts against the Voice of Conscience, for he does not like himself to be sacrificed.

22. *Question*—Is it only according to the teachings of the Vedic Religion that the Voice of Conscience is said to be inspiration from God ?

Answer—Yes.

Note—These questions relate to paras 136 and 137. Pt. Shiva Sharma also, like Swami Dayanand, considers that the Voice of Conscience is the inspiration from God. The object of Question No. 22 was to find out whether all the impulses of the Voice of Conscience in man are accepted as inspiration from God or only such of them are considered to be inspiration from God as are in conformity with the teachings of the Vedic religion. Pt. Shiva Sharma by giving the answer that only those impulses are from God which accord with the teachings of the Vedic religion, has laid down that impulses of the Voice of Conscience can be received from God as well as from some other source and it is possible for that person alone who is fully conversant with the teachings of the Vedic religion to determine which of these impulses are from God and which are not.

23. *Question*—The following argument has been given in regard to the principle of 'return from salvation':—

> "If God gives infinite result of actions which are limited, there would be nothing like God's justice."

The question is whether salvation means the attainment by the spirit of man of its original state after release from the entanglements of *Prakriti*, i.e. matter, etc. or does it mean that new forces come into existence within it ? In other words, whether on the attainment of salvation, some new powers awaken in the spirit or the spirit, after being released from matter, simply behaves in its own original form ?

Answer—The spirit freed from the entanglements of *Prakriti* attains its own real form and when this happens, the spirit begins to experience divine bliss.

24. *Question*—Under these circumstances, salvation is not the 'infinite' result of 'limited' actions. The objection of Swami Dayanand is that if man by performing actions for a certain time can attain salvation which is everlasting, God's justice would come to an end, but according to the answer given by you, the result of man's limited actions is the destruction of the entanglements of matter and not the attainment of salvation.

Answer—*Jivatma* is not dirty in its natural or original form. If it had been dirty in its original form, it would never have attained salvation. When the spirit, due to ignorance, establishes its connection with matter, it gets entangled, and when duly guided by knowledge it performs actions and its knowledge increases, it attains salvation. The limit of time or period of salvation has been fixed by God as reward for the knowledge and actions of man.

Note—These questions relate to paragraphs 55, 56 and 65 of Yathārtha Prakāśa Part I. It is clear from the answers that, like Swami Dayanand, Pandit Shiva Sharma also could not understand that Spiritual Practices only lead to release of the spirit from forces of opposition and the moment it gets release from these forces of opposition, it automatically attains salvation. Thus salvation is not the result of limited actions. The result of limited actions is the release of the spirit from the forces of opposition which are also limited. Therefore, this objection that "God's justice would come to an end if God would give infinite result for limited actions" is meaningless.

25. *Question*—On page 61 of the 4th Urdu Edition of the Satyārtha Prakāśa, while dealing with '*pratyakṣha jnana*', details of the objects of the five knowledge-senses have been given. The question now arises with regard to what was decided yesterday that one can form an idea of the Artist or the Creator on observing his workmanship. Then in that case, to which knowledge-sense of man does this workmanship pertain? And are the scientists of the world who do not believe in the existence of God devoid of that knowledge-sense?

Answer—Observation of the workmanship and skill of God pertains to the eye which all the scientists possess, but these scientists have formed the opinion that nature itself has adopted its present form.

26. *Question*—Is it possible for an ordinary man to have direct knowledge of the workmanship of some non-physical *Purusha* or *Jiva* just as he can have knowledge of the workmanship of animals and others who possess physical bodies and does he possess such knowledge ?

Answer—He can attain such direct knowledge and he has such direct knowledge.

27. *Question*—Would it be right if, on seeing such workmanship, somebody says that gods are its creators?

Answer—It would be right and if that god has the power to bring the creation into existence, that god then is God.

28. *Question*—When man sees thousands of artistic things in a shop, he thinks that there are thousands of manufacturers or makers of those things. Will it be permissible for man after seeing thousands of kinds of workmanship in nature, e.g., lions, elephants mosquitos, cows, diamonds, ordinary stones, etc., and so also fire, water, trees, mountains, rivers, the sun and the moon, etc. to imagine or think that the makers of the different things of workmanship referred to are different individuals ?

Answer—This will not be permissible.

29. *Question*—Is workmanship a natural quality of man or acquired ?

Answer—It is a natural quality.

30. *Question*—But there are hundreds of men who are devoid of workmanship ?

Answer—They have got the natural capacity for workmanship but they do not make use of that capacity for some reason or other.

31. *Question*—In this sense does every man possess the quality of workmanship ?

Answer—Of course, every man possesses the quality of workmanship, provided he makes use of his natural quality.

32. *Question*—Are the ideas of workmanship of God that one gets on seeing the workmanship in a knife and in an apple similar ?

Answer—On seeing the workmanship in the apple, one gets direct knowledge, i.e. without any obstruction, of the workmanship of God and on seeing workmanship in the knife, one gets indirect knowledge of the workmanship of God, because workmanship is expressed through an intermediary.

Note—These questions also relate to paragraphs 117 to 139. The subject is quite clear. The answer to Question 28 that 'it is not permissible' is sheer high-handedness. In order to understand it, paragraph 133 should be read carefully.

5th January, 1935

Time—3 p.m.

33. *Question*—Is workmanship the natural quality of man's physical body or his spirit ?

Answer—It is the quality of the spirit and the senses are its instruments.

34. *Question*—Then this quality should be possessed by all the spirits.

Answer—Yes.

35. *Question*—Is there any place in this creation where there are no spirits ?

Answer—As much of the entire creation as is conscious and vital is full of spirits and there are no spirits in the creation which is lifeless.

36. *Question*—And do all these spirits possess the quality of workmanship ?

Answer—Yes.

37. *Question*—If spirits fill the entire vital and conscious creation and every spirit makes use of its quality of workmanship, where should we then look for that workmanship by seeing which man thinks of the workmanship of God ?

Answer—The workmanship of God should be looked for in the lifeless creation.

38. *Question*—A stone idol is placed before you. Will every man inevitably think on seeing that idol that the maker of that idol is one artist only ?

Answer—It is not essential that one may think of only one artist. The maker of an idol can be one and may be more than one.

39. *Question*—How is it then that on seeing the material creation, the idea is formed that the Creator of all that creation is only one ?

Answer—Because, in the entire materiel creation, work is being carried on with equal intelligence and thus one gets the idea of there being only one creator.

40. *Question*—Did the stone idol which was placed before you indicate intelligence or did it not ?

Answer—It did.

41. *Question*—Why is it then that on seeing that idol

one does not get the idea of there being only one maker of that idol ?

Answer—Because the idol is small, i.e., it is found in one place. And as such, it can be made by many artists having limited intelligence and the material creation is great or very wide. Therefore its maker should also be only one, the possessor of great workmanship.

Note:—These questions have been asked to clarify the answer given to question No. 28. From the answers to Questions 39 to 41, the weakness of the position taken up by the Arya Samaj is apparent.

42. *Question*—Whether Ayurveda, Homeopathy, Allopathy, etc., are one and the same thing or are they different methods of treating diseases ?

Answer—They are different methods of treating the diseases.

43. *Question*—But the object of all these is only one i.e. to attain health. Can we not then call them as only one system of treatment ?

Answer—Even when the object is one, it creates no difficulty even if the methods are different. But it is not necessary that all the methods should be correct.

44. *Question*—Similarly, some teachers try to awaken the intelligence of children by the use of a cane and others do so by the use of toys. In these two cases, the methods and the principles being different, will these methods be not taken as two different methods ?

Answer—Yes. These will have to be taken as different methods.

45. *Question*—Then why is it stated in *Sammulas 7* of Satyārtha Prakāśa that "there is only difference of names between Justice and Mercy because the object that is achieved by justice is also achieved by mercy ?" Even when the object is the same, the methods should be different.

Answer—Both the methods are different from each other, but the object is one.

Note—These questions relate to paragraph 141. Evidently, Pt. Shiva Sharma agrees with us that Justice and Mercy are two different things, though their object is the same.

46. *Question*—It is stated that Swami Dayanand wandered for a long time in search of Perfect *Yogis* in the mountains and jungles but he did not contact any Perfect *Yogi*. Is this idea of mine correct ?

Answer—Your idea is correct.

47. *Question*—Whom would you call a Perfect *Yogi* ?

Answer—A Perfect *Yogi* is one who has achieved the eight *Siddhis*[1], i.e., *Laghima*[2], *Anima*[3], etc.

48. *Question*—It is also written that he ultimately became the disciple of Swami Virajanand and after finishing his study, he took the vow of serving his country and of lifting the true *Sastras* to their proper position. The question now is why Swami Dayanand is called a Perfect *Yogi*. Is it merely out of regard for him or was he really a Perfect *Yogi* ? If he was really a Perfect *Yogi*, where and from whom did he learn the science of *Yoga* ?

Answer—Swami Dayanand learnt many methods of *Yoga* at different places from different *Yogis*, and by the practice of those methods, he made considerable progress himself and thus gradually became a Perfect *Yogi* by his own efforts.

Note—These questions relate to paragraph 62. Pt. Shiva Sharma thinks that Swami Dayanand, after having learnt the practices of Yoga from imperfect Yogis gradually himself became a Perfect Yogi.

---

1. 'Siddhis' are supernatural powers acquired by means of Yōga. They are said to be eight. 2. One of the 'Siddhis' is 'Laghimā'. This enables a Yōgī to reduce the weight of his body almost to nothing. 3. One of the Siddhis. It enables the Yōgī to reduce the size of his body to the size of a small particle.

49. *Question*—Is it that a man on becoming a Perfect *Yogi* at one time is deprived of that high status if he gives up the practices?

Answer—Yes. If one does not perform the practices, there may be some change in his status; and then a Perfect *Yogi* may not remain a Perfect *Yogi*.

50. *Question*—It is stated in the Biography of Swami Dayanand that on May 1, 1879, Swami Dayanand went to Meerut and met Mr. Scott and Madame Blavatsky and other Theosophists at the house of Babu Chhedi Lal. During the conversation, Swami Dayanand said, "It is long since I left the practices, but even so I can perform this practice." And he also said, "I have preferred to help others and to guide them to the right path instead of making efforts for my own salvation by means of the practice of *Yoga* and this is the reason why I have given up the *Yoga* practices. But when I who am a man of only average practice can perform this much,...etc." This shows that Swami Dayanand had given up the practice of *Yoga* long before this conversation took place. And if a person does not remain a Perfect *Yogi* on giving up the practices of *Yoga* for some time, it appears that Swami Dayanand had given up the practice of *Yoga* long before this conversation took place. And if a person does not remain a Perfect *Yogi* on giving up the practices of *Yoga* for some time, it appears that Swami Dayanand was a Perfect *Yogi* at one time, but later on he did not remain a Perfect *Yogi*.

Answer—Yes. Swami Dayanand was a Perfect *Yogi* at that time. But if he had started the practice of *Yoga* once again, he would have easily become a Perfect *Yogi*.

Note—These questions relate to paragraph 71. In the answer, we have been made to believe that Swami Dayanand was a Perfect Yōgī, but ultimately he did not remain a Perfect Yōgī. But at what time did he become a Perfect Yōgī when in 1879 he admits that he was a man of average Yōga Practice?

51. *Question*—Is revelation possible only in the beginning of the creation or is it possible even later on? And can one have revelation even in modern times?

Answer—Revelation made by God in the beginning of creation was on such an extensive scale that there remained no need for any revelation in future. There can be no revelation after the beginning of the creation.

52. *Question*—It is stated that in the beginning of the creation there was revelation only to four *Rishis*, but it is also stated that afterwards for a considerable time, the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were made known to different *Rishis* at different times. Were these meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* made known to the *Rishis* by means of revelation or by some other method?

Answer—In the case of all other *Rishis* with the exception of the first four, the meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* were made known as a result of their own efforts and were not revealed by God. Even now man can find new meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas* by his own efforts. Thus Swami Dayanand has also stated in the Satyārtha Prakāśa that there may be men more learned than himself and they would be able to find out new meanings of the *mantras* of the *Vedas*, commensurate with the dignity of the *Vedas.*

53. *Question*—Why is Swami Dayanand called *Maharshi?*

Answer—Because Swami Dayanand described the meanings of the four *Vedas* correctly in the present age.

54. *Question*—Possibly these meanings were found out by Swami Dayanand, through his own personal efforts and they were not revealed to Him by God.

Answer—He found out these meanings by his own efforts and they were not revealed to him by God.

Note—These questions were asked in order to know whether the Veda

Bhāshya[1] of Swami Dayanand was prepared as result of revelation from God or is it only the result of his own efforts ? It is not necessary to add here that under these circumstances, the Veda Bhāshya of Swami Dayanand cannot be said to be an authoritative Bhāshya.

THE END

1. Commentary on the Vedas.

ERRATA

Page	3	Text	Line	3	In place of	communities	read	communities,
,,	3	,,	,,	6	,,	a little	,,	the least
,,	5	,,	,,	11	Drop words	begin to	after	they
,,	20	Notes	,,	4	In place of	2	read	3
,,	22	Text	,,	16	,,	Name.	,,	Name.”
,,	23	,,	,,	2	,,	Name.	,,	Name ?”
,,	27	,,	,,	12	Drop comma		after	should
,,	28	,,	,,	3	In place of	mortals	read	mortals,
,,	33	Notes	,,	3	,,	l fe	,,	life
,,	34	Text	,,	7	,,	Vide Pt.	,,	Vide ‘Pt.
,,	36	,,	,,	19	,,	sukhviśesha	,,	sukh viśesha
,,	53	,,	,,	34	,,	full stop	,,	?
,,	55	,,	,,	23	,,	The	,,	Only the
,,	56	,,	,,	11	Drop words	And as (		
,,	,,	,,	,,	12	Drop	bracket	after	stated
,,	,,	,,	,,	13	In place of	it, evidently	read	it. Evidently
,,	66	,,	,,	23	,,	64[1]	,,	64[3]
,,	67	,,	,,	6	Add	full stop	after	66
,,	84	,,	,,	31	In place of	thus	read	in this way
,,	85	,,	,,	6	,,	above.[2]	,,	above.[1]
,,	86	,,	,,	18	Add	full stop	after	ityādi
,,	,,	,,	,,	24	In place of	semicolon	read	comma
,,	96	Notes	,,	2	Add	2.	before	‘Nirmala
,,	105	Text	,,	1	In place of	V	read	VI
,,	107	,,	,,	27	,,	do any	,,	does anyone
,,	108	,,	,,	15	,,	frozen	,,	benumbed
,,	111	,,	,,	24	,,	Śāstras,	,,	Śāstras;
,,	115	,,	,,	18	,,	myself	,,	himself
,,	119	,,	,,	18	,,	VI	,,	VII
,,	120	,,	,,	27	,,	experince	,,	experience
,,	124	,,	Lines	13-14	Drop words	यह बात……करते ।		
,,	125	,,	Line	7	In place of	words	,,	word
,,	133	,,	,,	10	,,	540	,,	546
,,	135	,,	,,	6	,,	full stop	,,	?
,,	139	,,	,,	8	,,	قّول	,,	قّوِل
,,	141	,,	,,	4	,,	proud	,,	adament
,,	145	,,	,,	8	Drop word	with	after	enjoying
,,	145	Notes	,,	8	In place of	obtations	read	oblations
,,	148	Text	,,	19	,,	in	,,	to

Page	167	Text Line	27	In place of	Yah	read	Yeh
,,	169	,, ,,	15	,,	bullocks	,,	bullocks,
,,	,,	,, ,,	16	,,	buffalow	,,	buffalows
,,	172	,, ,,	10	,,	accidently	,,	by chance
,,	,,	,, ,,	22	,,	X	,,	XI
,,	173	,, ,,	19	,,	use	,,	us
,,	185	,, ,,	21	,,	birds	,,	birds,
,,	,,	,, ,,	22	,,	men	,,	men,
,,	192	,, ,,	5	In place of	prosperus	,,	prosperous
,,	,,	,, ,,	8	,,	केसा	,,	कैसा
,,	193	,, ,,	14	,,	on the one hand says	read	says on the one hand
,,	203	,, ,,	4	,,	needs	,,	thirst
,,	,,	,, ,,	29	,,	meaning	,,	meanings
,,	207	,, ,,	14	,,	quite good	,,	a good one
,,	212	,, Lines	23-24	,,	attributes just	,,	attributes. Just
,,	213	,, ,,	14	,,	preception	,,	perception
,,	214	,, ,,	6-7	,,	nose, has added	,,	nose, added
,,	216	,, ,,	7	Add words	has been laid	after	condition
,,	219	,, ,,	12	In place of	ليا	,,	کیا
,,	225	,, ,,	25	,,	God ?"	,,	God"?
,,	233	,, ,,	9	,,	directly	,,	directly,
,,	,,	,, ,,	22	,,	others	,,	others,
,,	,,	,, ,,	23	,,	together	,,	together,
,,	239	,, ,,	26	,,	aimāl	,,	a'imāl
,,	242	,, ,,	10	,,	There	,,	"There
,,	,,	,, ,,	28	,,	رهم	,,	رحم
,,	249	,, ,,	33	,,	king for	,,	king has for
,,	250	,, ,,	18	,,	man, but there	,,	man, there
,,	,,	,, ,,	23	,,	by	,,	with
,,	254	,, ,,	Last	,,	and a	,,	and also a
,,	255	,, ,,	29	,,	جیئون	,,	جیوون
,,	257	,, ,,	5	,,	ویدیه	,,	وید
,,	,,	,, ,,	24	,,	books	,,	books,
,,	258	,, ,,	8	,,	my	,,	our
,,	,,	,, ,,	12	,,	आर	,,	और
,,	263	,, ,,	4	,,	full stop	,,	?
,,	266	,, ,,	8	,,	fully	,,	in full
,,	268	,, ,,	4	,,	Behave	,,	Act

Page		Line				
Page 272	Text	Line 7-8	In place of	may be burnt to ashes, every part of him.	read	every part of him may be burnt to ashes.
,, ,,	,,	,, 18	,,	razors.	,,	razors,
,, 280	,,	,, 14	,,	non-eternal but this	,,	non-enternal, this
,, 282	,,	,, 7	,,	meaning	,,	meanings
,, 284	,,	,, 27	,,	!	,,	?
,, 287	,,	,, 15	,,	Sutra'	,,	Sutra
,, ,,	,,	,, 16	,,	commentatators	,,	commentator
,, 300	,,	,, 26	,,	cannot	,,	could not
,, 301	,,	,, 27	,,	avilable	,,	available
,, 307	,,	,, 24	,,	acqnire	,,	acquire
,, 309	,,	,, 21	,,	provide	,,	produce
,, 311	,,	,, 6	,,	the plants	,,	plants
,, ,,	,,	,, 6	,,	the cereals	,.	cereals
,, 324	,,	,, 14	,,	Qusetion	,,	Question

Publications of the Radhasoami Satsang Sabha, Dayalbagh

Books by Param Guru Soamiji Maharaj

No.	Title	Language	Pages	Rs. nP.
1.	Sar Bachan (Poetry)	*Hindi*	Pages 938	~~7.00~~
2.	Sar Bachan (Prose)	,,	,, 197	~~(In print)~~ 3.50

Books by Param Guru Huzur Maharaj

No.	Title	Language	Pages	Rs. nP.
3.	Radhasoami Mat Prakash	*English*	Pages 106	1.50
4.	Pilgrims Path (Letters of Param Guru Huzur Maharaj)	,,	,, 80	1.50
5.	Radhasoami Mat Sandesh	*Hindi*	,, 80	1.00
6.	Radhasoami Mat Updesh	,,	,, 68	1.00
7.	Nij Updesh	,,	,, 70	~~(In print)~~
8.	Prem Updesh	,,	,, 80	~~(In print)~~
9.	Sar Updesh	,,	,, 125	1.25
10.	Prashnottar	,,	,, 54	1.00
11.	Jugat Prakash	,,	,, 122	~~2.00~~
12.	Prem Bani Part I	,,	,, 454	5.00
13.	Prem Bani Part II	,,	,, 429	~~4.25~~
14.	Prem Bani Part III	,,	,, 420	~~4.25~~
15.	Prem Bani Part IV	,,	,, 180	~~2.50~~
16.	Prem Patra Part I	,,	,, 455	~~4.00~~ 4.25
17.	Prem Patra Part II	,,	,, 441	4.00

Book by Param Guru Sarkar Sahab

No.	Title	Language	Pages	Rs. nP.
18.	Prem Samachar	*Hindi*	Pages 66	~~1.25~~

Books translated under the authority of the Radhasoami Satsang Sabha

Into Bengali

No.	Title	Pages	Rs. nP.
19.	Radhasoami Mat Prakash By Param Guru Huzur Maharaj	Pages 100	1.25
20.	Amrit Vachan (Translation of 'Discourses on Radhasoami Faith' by H.H. Maharaj Sahab)	Pages 212	3.00

Into English

No.	Title	Pages	Rs. nP.
21.	Sar Bachan (Prose) By Param Guru Soami ji Maharaj	Pages 175	3.25
22.	Prem Patra Part I By Param Guru Huzur Maharaj	Pages 377	6.00
23.	Prem Patra Part II ,,	Pages 381	6.00
24.	Prem Patra Part III ,,	Pages 370	6.00
25.	Prem Patra Part IV ,,	Pages 326	6.00
26.	Prem Patra Part V ,,	Pages 336	6.00
27.	Prem Patra Part VI ,,	Pages 104	2.00

(P. T. O.)

Books translated under the authority of the Radhasoami Satsang Sabha (Continued)

No.	Title		Pages	Rs.nP.
28.	Yathārtha Prakāśa Part I (Special Edition) By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 186	6.00
29.	Yathārtha Prakāśa Part I (Ordinary Edition) By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 186	3.50
30.	Yathārtha Prakāśa Part II By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 315	5.50
31.	Yathārtha Prakāśa Part III (Vol. I) By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 341	5.50
32.	Yathārtha Prakāśa Part III (Vol. II) By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 273	~~4.00~~ 5.00
33.	Jijñāsā By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 42	1.00
34.	Radhasoami Mat Darśana By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj	,, ,,	,, 62	1.00
35.	Prem Sandeśa By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj	,, ,,	,, 64	1.00
36.	Discourses (Delivered in Satsang) Pt. I By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		Pages 182	4.00
37.	Discourses (Delivered in Satsang) Pt. II By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		,, 242	~~4.00~~ 4.50
38.	Discourses (Delivered in Satsang) Pt. III By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		,, 152	3.50
39.	Jatan Prakāśa By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		,, 45	1.00
40.	Selections from Prem Sandeśa By H.H. Sahabji Maharaj		,, 65	1.00

Books written or edited under the authority of the Radhasoami Satsang Sabha

No.	Title	Language	Pages	Rs.nP.
41.	Four Letters (By Param Guru Sarkar Sahab)	*English*	Pages 42	~~(In print)~~ 1/-
42.	Silvery Speeches	,,	,, 60	~~0.25~~
43.	Shabd Sangrah Part I	*Hindi*	,, 301	3.50
44.	Shabd Sangrah Part II	,,	,, 460	~~3.50~~ 4.00
45.	Sant Bani Sangrah Part I	,,	,, 82	1.00
46.	Sant Bani Sangrah Part II	,,	,, 116	1.25
47.	Ratnavali	,,	,, 86	1.00
48.	Dayalbagh Pamphlet (~~Small~~)	*English*	,, 40	~~0.37~~ 0.50